

The American Historical Review

VAGARIES OF HISTORIANS¹

MAN has an instinctive curiosity concerning processes; though he has been baffled a thousand times in his search for ultimate causes, he turns eagerly to watch causes unfold. If he can not discover the *why* of things, he can observe with the utmost accuracy the *how* of things; and possibly he may be able, after a sufficiently ample investigation, to deduce the *why* from the *how*. The reason may be indirectly disclosed by the process.

There is another instinct strong in man, and that is his instinct for certitude. He does not rest tranquil amid doubts. The missing link in a chain of evidence or argument torments him, and if he can not find it, he busies himself in imagining what it ought to be like.

These two instincts have never been more active than during the last half century. You have only to glance through an approved history of the literature of any country in order to see with what perfect precision and assuredness the work is done. The sequence of cause and effect rolls on as smoothly as does the leather belt which turns the wheels in a factory. There are no gaps, no doubts, no hesitation. Take the history of American literature, for example, and see how simply Washington Irving is "accounted for", and then how naturally William Cullen Bryant followed him, and when you come to the New England School, how Emerson, and Hawthorne, and Longfellow, and Whittier, and Holmes, are beautifully related each to each in a fatal rack-and-pinion combination. There is an implied causal connection, and everything is so perfectly adjusted that you begin to infer that nature amuses herself by playing an unending ball-and-socket game.

If you allow your mind a little freedom, however, or even indulge in a little common sense—that most uncommon and little

¹ Presidential address prepared to be read before the American Historical Association, at Cleveland, December 28, 1918.

valued of human attributes—you must perceive that the causal relationship among those American authors was purely imaginary. Emerson might have flourished and have been the complete Emerson whom we know, although Holmes and Hawthorne had never existed; and so not one of them was important, much less indispensable, to the development of the others. I do not mean, of course, that being contemporaries and acquaintances they had no superficial influences on each other, but I do mean that they were structurally independent.

Now to write literary history in this fashion is to falsify. The persons who produce it mean no harm; they are simply the unconscious victims of the instinct for process and of the instinct for precision; having only half-learned the theory of evolution, they inevitably misuse it. Six or eight authors of a given generation loom up before them; what can be more certain than that these authors have some occult evolutionary interdependence?

Thus do personalities, the most fluid and elusive of essences, become petrified and standardized and made to fit into one another, and into the pattern which the historian has devised, as if they were pieces of metal, moulded into interlocking parts of a soulless machine.

The same calamity befalls a national history, or any episode in it, in the hands of historians of this sort. They, too, must account for everything, and carefully dovetail one incident into another, leaving no gap, for fear they may be thought undiligent, or inaccurate. So we have from them a perfectly consecutive story without breach or suture, the product, though the writers know it not, of our common craving for certitude. No class of our historical writers seems more prone to this defect than do the documentarians—by whom I mean those who devote themselves almost entirely to the inspection of documents, which they come sometimes to worship as fetishes. They withdraw themselves so far from actual life that they fail to understand that the written document alone is not the sole material of history, nor is it always the best.

The historian comes to his work with many prepossessions which must, if he gives them free play, lead him to strange and unexpected results. It is as if some demon urged him not to use his own eyes but to wear colored glasses; and as the colors vary, so will his pictures. The prepossessions of race, of creed, of a political party, or of an economic school are all temptations which he must resist. A judicious reader will not, of course, be deceived by them; indeed they will often help him to know more intimately than he otherwise could the principles and the desires which sway the

zealots of creed or party. The writer who strives to be neutral or parades his impartiality may often lead us farther from the truth than does the partizan whose very zeal discloses it.

But there are still larger prepossessions which I may call cosmic. These are based on your ultimate conception of the universe, on what you think life is, and on your duties and relations towards it. I need hardly say that as long as man was regarded not only as the central object for which the earth was created, but also as the very sum and crown of life in the visible universe, the historians in the bonds of these prepossessions made a very different story of man's deeds than anybody would make now. The Jews, for instance, looked upon themselves as the Chosen People, and in the Old Testament they pieced together fact, tradition, myth, poetry, religious and civil laws, and even sanitary and hygienic ordinances so as to prove their assumption. The early chronicles of other peoples—of Egyptians and Assyrians, of Babylonians and Chinese—have similar features. Even the open-minded and keen-sighted Greeks did not escape from assigning to Hellas supreme importance: the gods of Hellas were to them indisputably the highest of all deities, just as they themselves, the Hellenes, were first among men.

When we read the works of the Jews or Greeks, or other ancient peoples, we must remember, therefore, that this conviction of primacy lay in the back of the mind of each of them. It came to be taken for granted; it ceased to be debated or discussed.

Substituting creeds for races, we find just such a prepossession in the case of Christians and Mohammedans, and later, when Christians became divided, between Protestants and Roman Catholics. There was always the primal assumption that one creed was orthodox and that the supporters of all the other creeds were heretics. Likewise, among races yours was civilized and all the others were barbarian.

In the nineteenth century, however, came the revelation, now generally accepted among intelligent peoples, that the earth is not the centre of the universe, and consequently man's cosmic position has completely changed. His history, at least so far as it concerns ultimates, must be wholly revised. As we look out at the Milky Way on a clear frosty night, we no longer modestly assume that its millions of stars and all the other suns and constellations were created and are whirling forever on their immeasurable circuits for the benefit of us mere men. Not only the scale by which we measure has changed, but the degree and the purpose.

The modern key word for solving the enigma is evolution, development, growth, not special creation according to theological

assertions and guesses. After trying this key in every lock during the past sixty or seventy years, we find, as it seems to me, that it has opened to us not the secret of life itself, but the process by which we and all other living things, and all forms of matter, live.

Inevitably, the study of history and its writing felt the change and felt it so imperiously that for the last half-century historical students and writers have sought deliberately to record the process of evolution in human affairs. No doubt, the formula helps us to advance a long way towards truth, and it supersedes all the fantastic and arbitrary formulas which men employed earlier. But the question for us now is, how far should we employ it? Shall we make it so paramount that it obtrudes? Should it not rather be like the skeleton in man and most vertebrate animals, which really determines their form and motions but is concealed beneath a covering of flesh? The turtle, to be sure, wears its skeleton on its outside, but the turtle is, after all, neither the highest nor the most beautiful kind of animal. And may we not be misled by employing too rigidly in the human field formulas which apply best to the domain of matter, to the field of chemistry, for example, or of physics, or of astronomy?

I have long had my doubts as to the accuracy or propriety of calling history a science. We investigate historical material in the same way that a chemist investigates his material, but we must not therefore assume that the two sorts of materials are identical, or that the employment of similar methods by historians and chemists makes history a science in the same sense that chemistry is one. In these matters we are apt to quarrel over the mere words, the names of things, rather than over the things themselves behind the words. But in general I feel that the less an historian has to do with science, the less he deliberately imitates and assumes scientific aims and conclusions, the better.

Recently, on re-reading Henry Adams's *A Letter to American Teachers of History*,² I was confirmed in my conviction. How many know that extraordinary *Letter* by our master ironist—and, may I not also say, our master historian? There are passages in it so cryptic and other parts in which the intricacies of physics and dynamics are treated with such a nimble raillery, that I am not sure that I wholly understand them. But Henry Adams's main thesis is clear enough. He had come very early on the theory of evolution and on the Darwinian illustrations of it, and then his eager and inquisitive mind had turned from organic nature to the study of mathematical and physical laws. Before you can know an animal

² Privately printed in 1910.

or a man thoroughly you must know the laws of gravity, embolism, and all the other processes which control his physical growth.

For a few decades the scientific world rested complacently on the new demonstration of the law of the conservation of energy. Now, according to Mr. Adams's view, history written by anyone who understood this law should in some way embody it, just as history written about the Saracens should reveal the Mohammedan creed, which formed the background of their life and actions. The revelation would not necessarily be formal or definite or vivid, but you would always be able to infer what it was that made the Saracens unlike other races.

Chronos, however, still devours his children as voraciously as he did when the old Greek myth-maker first caught him at this cannibalistic work. Hardly was the great law of the conservation of energy accepted as final, before William Thomson, better known to posterity as Lord Kelvin, flung into the scientific world his law of the dissipation of mechanical energy, which had been, in fact, propounded as early as 1824 by Carnot. According to Kelvin's later definitive statement his law was as follows:

1. There is at present in the material world a universal tendency to the dissipation of mechanical energy.
2. Any restoration of mechanical energy, without more than an equivalent of dissipation, is impossible in inanimate material processes, and is probably never effected by means of organized matter, either endowed with vegetable life or subjected to the will of an animated creature.
3. Within a finite period of time past, the earth must have been, and within a finite period of time to come, the earth must again be, unfit for the habitation of man as at present constituted, unless operations have been, or are to be performed, which are impossible under the laws to which the known operations going on at present in the material world are subject.

Mr. Adams devotes two hundred pages to a keen and often dazzling examination of this law, and of the stupendous deductions to be drawn from it. We need not follow him in the details. He may or may not be right in such a matter as suggesting that all fossil traces of the missing link which connected man with his simian forerunners have been buried beneath the polar ice-cap which gradually covered the earthly paradise existing round the North Pole before the Glacial Period. The upshot of his wit and analysis and argument and suggestion is destructive; for he implies that while the theory of evolution on its pleasant side pointed to the upward progress of humanity, it registered on its ruthless

side the fated extinction of individuals and species, of tribe and race.

How does all this affect the historian? First of all, Henry Adams would have the historian wisely instructed in the foundations of science, almost to such a degree that he might with a little extra study qualify as a teacher of physics. Next, the historian, being saturated with Kelvin's law of the dissipation of energy, would so construct his history as to make it appear as an illustration of the working of that law. If I understand him, an adequate history of the Peloponnesian War or of the American Revolution would disclose how each was an experiment, so to speak, not merely in politics and war, but also in the dissipation of energy. There would be obvious difficulties in the way. What means of measuring this dissipation would the historian have? If Kelvin's law is true, there must have been less energy in 1865, when our Civil War ended, than in 1861, when it began. The energy dissipated during these four years was not only human but material, solar, sidereal, cosmic. Who can compute it?

And, after all, why should we inject into our description of human affairs the law of dissipation rather than the law of gravitation, or of capillary attraction, or the binomial theorem? So far as any of these scientific truths, or any other, affected the conduct of men we may notice them, but not otherwise. The discoveries of Copernicus and the laws framed by Kepler, when they affected religion and theology and led to the efforts of hierarchs to persecute those persons who believed them, were as humanly pertinent as was any of the dogmas which caused religious wars. But in general, scientific facts, theories, and doctrines, should be reserved for the histories of science.

So far as Henry Adams reaches a conclusion, I may sum it up in his own words:

If the entire universe, in every variety of active energy, organic and inorganic, human or divine, is to be treated as clock-work that is running down, society can hardly go on ignoring the fact forever. Hitherto it has often happened that two systems of education, like the Scholastic and Baconian, could exist side by side for centuries . . . by no more scientific device than that of the shutting their eyes to each other; but the universe has been terribly narrowed by thermodynamics. Already History and Sociology gasp for breath.

The department of History needs to concert with the departments of biology, sociology, and psychology some common formula or figure to serve their students as a working model for the study of the vital energies; and this figure must be brought into accord with the figures or formulas used by the departments of physics and mechanics to serve their students as models for the working of physico-chemical and me-

chanical energies. Without the adhesion of physicists, the model would cause greater scandal than though the contradictions were silently ignored as now; but the biologists—or, at least, the branches of science concerned with humanity—will find great difficulty in agreeing on any formula which does not require from physics the abandonment, in part, of the second law of thermodynamics. The mere formal exception of Reason from the express operation of the law, as a matter of teaching in the workshop, is not enough. Either the law must be abandoned in respect to Vital Energy altogether, or Vital Energy must abandon Reason altogether as one of its forms, and return to the old dilemma of Descartes.

Here is science with a vengeance, enough one would suppose to satisfy the most zealous professor of scientific history, and much more than enough to tax the learning and wits of most of those who write and study any history. In reading Henry Adams's astonishing tract, I cannot help suspecting at times that he is making fun of us historians; for he proposes, as I think you would agree with me, something which is not only impossible for anyone to carry out but which he himself never even attempted to carry out. In all the nine volumes of his *American History*, is there a hint of the second law of thermodynamics? Can you discover the slightest trace of a common formula for history and physical chemistry?

I find, on the contrary, Henry Adams's annals of Jefferson and Madison packed full of *human* stuff. He is not content merely to mention a man by name; he draws that man's portrait. The interactions of persons, the rivalries of political parties, the intrigues of competing groups, the clashing of international diplomacy, are not described as examples of abstract laws, but as workings of the human will through concrete human beings. And how delicately and surely are his descriptions drawn! How admirably he probes the baffling complexes of character! And with what a wealth of allusion, borrowed equally from history and literature, he enriches his portraits and views! His reflections tinged with sarcasm, which springs now from his pessimism and now from his irony, complete this masterly specimen of historical writing.

In other words, Henry Adams refutes by his practice the theories which he professed. He was in the prime of life, in the years round fifty, when he wrote the *History*. He was twenty years older when he wrote the *Letter to Teachers of History*. Some men grow more abstract as they grow old; their interest in persons gives way to a greater interest in laws. I do not say that this was the case with Mr. Adams. Certainly, his *Mont St. Michel and Chartres* and his *Education*, written when he was sixty and over, have no mathemat-

ical chill and no thermodynamical abstractions about them.³ But he was a man possessed from youth to age with a passion for knowing the ultimate truth. Not having found that in religion, he turned to science, and when science, through Lord Kelvin, revealed to him the law of the dissipation of energy, he believed that in that law he touched ultimate truth. And so he exerted himself to trace the operation of that law in organic nature, including man, not less than in the inorganic world.

Your own view of life and human destiny must be greatly affected if, instead of believing in the upward progress of mankind as it develops on the earth and in its limitless perfectibility in other worlds, you interpret Kelvin's law as Henry Adams did; that is, if you regard the energy of the universe as a clock that is slowly running down with the certainty that after millions, or it may be billions, of years its last ounce of power will be dissipated and there will be absolutely *nothing* left. The prospect does not cheer; and yet I submit that even the historian who holds this view has no more business to mix it up with the history he writes, than the painter who believes in annihilation has to let that belief interfere with the portrait he is painting of a beautiful woman.

No matter what a man does, he will doubtless reveal himself in ways he little suspects; I insist, however, that the historian should no more convert his history of a period or episode in the life of a people into a proof of Kelvin's law of thermodynamics than into a disproof of quadratic equations. The time may come when human affairs may be described no longer by words and sentences, but by a system of symbols or notation similar to those used in algebra and chemistry. Then it may be possible, as Mr. Adams suggests, to invent a common formula for thermodynamics and history. I once had sent to me by a stranger a conclusive demonstration, which I could not refute, in the form of a combination of trapezoids, polygons, and parallelopipedons, of the doctrine of the Trinity. Perhaps I ought to add that the man was crazy; but his diagram taught me never to assert that anything is impossible.

You may say that no sensible man would attempt to write history as a demonstration of Kelvin's law of dissipation; and yet you may insist that history is, nevertheless, a science and should be written as a science. You may, for instance, have been fascinated by that remarkable philosophic guesser, Giovanni Battista Vico, whose fertile and luminous suggestions lighted up a murky age as a

³ To be strictly accurate, Henry Adams, in the final chapters of the *Education*, refers to his excursions into science; but these chapters are hardly read with the most profit or remembered with the most pleasure.

shower of meteorites lights up a November evening. Convinced that his law of cycles in human development is well founded, you may wish to show this by your treatment of some historical theme. How will you do this? Where will you find the inevitable sequence of events which alone could make your proof scientific? What right have you to assume that progress is a regular moving forward? How do you know that it may not be an advance like that of the knight in chess? Is Vico's series of cycles, which so captivate the imagination, more than a glorified metaphor? Is it really more scientific than the old, old simile that this life is like the chrysalis, and that death is the happy liberation of the imprisoned butterfly into another ampler life?

But why should we seek farther for evidence of the danger of trying to fit history to any theory when we, and the whole world, have been struggling to break loose from the coils of a misinterpreted phrase? I do not believe that the atrocious war into which the Germans plunged Europe in August, 1914, and which has subsequently involved all lands and all peoples, would ever have been fought, or at least would have attained its actual gigantic proportions, had the Germans not been made mad by the theory of the survival of the fittest. The Germans are the most amazing doctrinaires the world has ever seen; they are also the greatest pedants. Whatever subject attracts their attention, obsesses them; and to be obsessed means to lose contact with the normal measures and perspectives of life.

So the phrase, "the survival of the fittest", obsessed them. Studying only the animal kingdom, they concluded that fitness was won by and depended upon brute force. The species possessing the greatest amount of force was, therefore, the fittest. Any of us, though we be not naturalists, can see how untrue this conclusion is, even when applied to the animal world. Frail creatures survive in spite of all the efforts of the strong creatures which prey upon them; and some of the frail have a far longer geologic ancestry than has the lion or the elephant. Insect tribes which flit hither and thither at the will of a passing breeze, date back aeons on aeons to conditions when no mammal trod the earth. If brute force alone were the test of fitness to survive, how could this be?

But we see, of course, that the vital consideration is, what do you mean by fitness? The fishes have a certain fitness which enables them to swim and to live under water; snakes have another by which they glide; insects and birds are fitted to fly; animals and man to walk and run. If you examine all these creatures, on the physical side alone, you find that something besides strength, phys-

ical force, has accounted for their being able to adjust themselves to their environment. Now, when we discover that at a certain point in mankind's evolution *moral* considerations come in, we see that as the race develops morals play a more and more important part in determining fitness to survive. The higher races, like the higher individual types, cease to regard the possession of power—brute power, enabling them to kill or enslave their neighbors—as their final aim. In a family the brothers who are physically stronger do not beat their weaker sisters; in society, we do not allow the brawny man of six feet two, merely because he is big, to persecute or destroy the little man of five feet. Civilization lives by ideals, by standards with which the girth of a man's chest or the thrust of his thighs has nothing to do.

The Germans, however, in their obsession, left all this out. If Hindenburg, colossal in form and brutish in nature, could knock down, trample, and destroy Goethe, shall we say that he thereby could prove that he was fitter than Goethe to survive? At any rate, in the imaginary conflict, he survived, and Goethe didn't.

This obsession it is which underlies the German ambition to rule the world. Being a very conceited and a very envious people, the Germans were easily led by their masters into believing that they were the fittest of all peoples to survive. Their men of science assured them that biology established that, and they were too devout materialists to question a supposed biological law, especially one which so flattered themselves. To convert them through education and military training into a warlike people, to persuade them that war is the highest duty, the noblest pursuit of man, to poison their conscience by teaching them that in war neither morals nor humanity have any place, these were easy tasks for the ambitious Prussian war-lords and their docile servants. Thus, we see the damnation into which those are led who misinterpret a phrase, or a law, if you will, and would make history and biology their accomplices in the most frightful crimes ever committed against laws human and divine.

Let us rather strive to redeem history from the bonds of scientific formulas, and of scientific purposes. Let us strive to humanize it. In so doing, the historian will abdicate no high and hard-won office; on the contrary, he will rise to the full glory of his mission. If he must have some watchword to guide him, let that watchword be "Man the Measure"—*man*, not the laws which apply to the animal kingdom, or to unthinking and soulless matter. Human nature is the substance in which the historian must work. He must try to discover how the human will—that force more mysterious

than electricity—shapes and directs the deeds of men. These deeds it is which make up the web of history. In this web, one deed leads to and determines the next, one event succeeds another in what seems to be a fated chain of cause and effect.

May we not say that there are three classes of historians? First, those who fix their attention on externals, that is, on deeds and events which are visible to everyone; next, those who search for the inner motive, the operation of the will behind the outward acts; and finally, those who, through their description of the outer, interpret the inner causes. I do not mean to imply that an historian deliberately, or even consciously, enrolls himself in one or another of these classes. His case is like that of a painter who expresses his temperament through color or through line according to his native talent. Of course, I would not imply that the division between one class of historian and another is always rigid; on the contrary, the classes often overlap.

As every historical student who has done more than scrape the surface of his subject knows, he encounters his chief difficulty when he deals with motives. It is easy enough to epitomize or paraphrase a file of consecutive documents; the real task is to search out the motives which gave rise to them. These are often unrecorded, or elusive, needing to be deduced or divined by some special instinct in the historian. This power of divination distinguishes the physician who is a master in diagnosis from his fellows who may be even more learned than he, but who lack it; this truth applies to historians also.

Those who regard history as the manifestation of will reap the richest compensation in its study. The very uncertainty of its operations, the gaps in the evidence, the *impasses*, the contradictions which need to be adjusted, keep the mind continually on the alert, and tease the wits to discover a solution. When we deal with history in the mass, over long periods of time, we are less likely to discern manifestations of will. Multitudes seem to move by a collective momentum, as a flood does, without foresight or choice, at the mercy of brute, material laws. Only when we come to that stage in human development where individuals emerge from the vast indistinct masses and lead them, or at least visibly influence them, does will confront us. This is what makes the history of Athens so much more significant and interesting than that of ancient Assyria or of Egypt; this is what gives modern and contemporary history, abounding in many well-defined individuals, its absorbing attraction for us; this is what makes biography the crowning flower of history, as portraiture is of painting.

Even if we were able to search the hearts of men to the bottom, and to know all their motives, there would still remain what we call chance, or fortune, to disconcert and puzzle us. Sometimes we can see plainly enough from what quarter the stroke of chance comes, but we never can *foresee* it, and it is this inability of the historian to foresee which differentiates him from the students of exact science. The Athenian general, Nicias, refused to withdraw his army from Syracuse at a time when it might have been saved. His reason was that an eclipse occurred, and he regarded this as a bad omen. If the Greeks had known more astronomy, they could have predicted the eclipse; further, the Athenians might well have known how Nicias was influenced by such portents, so that there was really no chance in the affair; but at the time it seemed as if the Athenians were the sport of unpredictable fortune. If President Wilson, or Mr. Lloyd George, were to die to-night, the course of world events would inevitably be deflected, but in what direction, or how far, we cannot foresee. Thus, the caprices of fortune, added to the difficulty of fathoming human motives, increase the labors and pique the zest of the historian.

It may be that Sesostris was as great an individual as Napoleon, and that his conquests and government were as significant as Napoleon's; but we shall never believe it because we shall never know about Rameses the Second a thousandth part of what we know about Napoleon. I am aware that among some historical students today who regard history as the interaction of impersonal, abstract laws, Napoleon is looked upon as a "negligible quantity", but I am unskilled in using either the telescope or the microscope when it comes to examining human deeds and motives. A man's eyes are the only proper instrument for scrutinizing men. Not merely Napoleon, but mankind, and our earth itself, must seem negligible, if their existence is known at all to the other denizens of the sidereal wilderness; but the historian has no more to do with the limitless perspectives of astronomy than with the elusive intricacies of thermodynamics.

Let me repeat that "Man the Measure" should be the guiding motto for those who would write history in human terms.

We historians have the noblest of callings. Unlike the dramatist or the epic poet, we do not invent our plot nor create the characters in the play. The Creator of all things supplies these. It is for us to discern them accurately, to describe them with all the truth there is in us, and to make them live again; for *life* is the one indispensable God-given essence, and it must throb through our copies as it did through their models. Years ago, Bonnat, the French painter,

was making a portrait of an American, and he came so unpleasantly close and looked so hard and intently that the American drew back and asked what it meant. "Good heavens!" replied Bonnat, "I am competing with God, and I must see everything which He has put into your face."

We historians also compete with God, and we must leave nothing undone to make our poor transcripts of His masterpieces true to the divine originals.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

THE WAR-SCARE OF 1875

In the *Gedanken und Erinnerungen* of Prince Bismarck there is no chapter more interesting than the one which bears the title, "Intrigen", and none which better displays the great chancellor's disregard for so small a matter as the truth. In that chapter, sandwiched between the affairs of Arnim and Eulenburg, the better to enhance its insignificance and dishonorable connections, is to be found Bismarck's brief and contemptuous account of the crisis of 1875. It is a bold statement, though not an exaggeration, to say that hardly a sentence of that forceful and convincing narrative can escape being branded, when the evidence is weighed, as a more or less deliberate falsehood. The incidents with which it deals are certainly very perplexed and obscure at the best; but they would probably be much less so to-day, if this central character had never made public his statement of the case.

The material actually available on the subject is indeed very slight, but it is constantly being added to from various sources. One of the chief of these, the diplomatic correspondence of Gontaut-Biron, the French ambassador at Berlin, has been drawn upon by Hanotaux, and also by André Dreux in his account of the last years of that diplomat's mission. From time to time other contributions are made, as in the recently published biographies of Sir Robert Morier, of Lord Lyons, and of Count Andrassy, and in the memoirs of Prince Hohenlohe.¹ The general trend of recent accounts has been on the whole toward exonerating Bismarck from the charge first brought against him of having deliberately plotted the destruction of France; but at the same time the effect of the new evidence is to discredit more and more the German chancellor's own account, which is that he was himself the victim of a vast conspiracy intended to blacken his reputation and to undermine his policies.

About the only general introductory observation that can be made as to the incident of 1875 is that there was a "scare"—which has been singled out as "the scare" from a whole series of similar alarms extending over a considerable period of years. How frightened the various parties really were, how much foundation existed

¹ Professor Serge Gorainov had ready for the press a year ago a documentary study of the affair which would clear up many points upon which little more than conjecture can now be made. It is only the uncertain fate of his manuscript which may make this present study worth while.

(196)

for their fears, who was responsible for spreading the alarm—these are the questions which require to be considered.

Bismarck's own story begins with a misstatement to the effect that, at the beginning of the year, the French ambassador at Berlin made a trip to Petrograd for the purpose of arranging with the Russian chancellor, Gorchakov, the details of the plot.² His choice of a scapegoat is an unfortunate one to begin with, for the charge is far from being in accord with the character of the man against whom it is made. Of a refined and sensitive nature, profoundly affected by the humiliation which had befallen his country and wholly devoted to the task of maintaining her international dignity, Gontaut-Biron was the type of a conscientious and painstaking diplomat, and not at all the man to engineer the gigantic *coup de théâtre* into the sources of which we are here introduced. Bismarck did not shrink from pressing this charge to the ambassador's face in an extremely painful interview which took place at the end of the year. Although reduced to silence by the reply, supported by circumstances in the nature of proof, that Gontaut had not been in Russia since nearly two years before, the chancellor is troubled by no scruples in reviving the story for public enlightenment. As to the visit which actually did occur, in February, 1874, there is no doubt that it was the occasion for discussion of the danger of a new war with Germany; and Gontaut records that Gorchakov expressed himself in a manner highly reassuring to France;³ but the whole connection of the incident with those of 1875 is too remote to deserve particular attention.

The insistence upon this affair in the *Gedanken und Erinnerungen* has somewhat the air of being designed to obscure the importance of a later mission, the fact of which cannot be disputed, although its object has been much discussed. That Radowitz, a confidant of Bismarck, the recently appointed minister to Athens, and a diplomat of much too high a standing to be used on mere temporary missions without some higher end in view, had been sent, in February, 1875, to fill the post at Petrograd vacated by the illness of Prince Reuss, was matter of common knowledge and alarm to the entire diplomatic world. Suspicions led to inquiries and inquiries to the formulation of the account that Radowitz had been sent to bribe Russia for a free hand against France by the offer of a free hand in the Orient. Such was the story obtained by Gontaut from the wife of a Russian chamberlain and by General

² Bismarck, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen* (Stuttgart, 1898), II. 172.

³ André Dreux, *Dernières Années de l'Ambassade en Allemagne de M. Gontaut-Biron* (Paris, 1907), pp. 48-49.

Le Flô from the court rumors at Petrograd.⁴ Lord Odo Russell, the English ambassador at Berlin, and Dr. Geffcken, close friend of the crown prince, also have it from sources unnamed.⁵ Bismarck and his apologists have never succeeded in explaining the story away nor in offering a satisfactory one to take its place. Wertheimer, in his life of Andrassy, basing his account on the Radowitz despatches themselves, gives only the impression in the end that the sounding of Russia was very covertly conducted, and does not dispel the suspicion that something very like the proposals with which rumor credited him were actually the basis of his negotiations with the Russian court.⁶ At all events, Radowitz came back empty-handed when Prince Reuss was able again to relieve him from the post. His connection with the affair of 1875 is far from finished, however, for he was soon to get his master into difficulties even more serious and harder to explain away.

Apart from the mission of Radowitz, there was no lack of ground for uneasiness in diplomatic circles as to Germany's intentions toward France. At no epoch, indeed, since the treaty of Frankfort can we fairly say that apprehensions on that score were completely absent. Bismarck himself saw to that. Considerably taken aback by France's rapid recovery from her disasters and convinced that the idea of revenge was always uppermost in her national consciousness, he was constantly bent upon making her realize the hopelessness of those dreams and her dependence upon the good-will of her powerful neighbor for the very right to exist. He let slip no opportunity of declaring that she would never even be allowed to bring any bellicose plans to maturity, but that the mere indication of their existence would be the signal for her complete and sudden destruction. "We wish to keep the peace", he told Hohenlohe in 1874, "but if the French so order their preparations that in five years they will be ready and determined to strike, then in three years we shall begin the war."⁷ Not that the great chancellor could ever have seriously considered the possibility of France's attaining to sufficient military strength to dare enter upon the conflict single-handed; but he had also to consider that her posi-

⁴ Dreux, pp. 115-116; E. Flourens, *Alexandre III.* (Paris, 1894), p. 300, Le Flô to Decazes, April 21, 1875.

⁵ Mrs. Rosslyn Wemyss, *Memoirs and Letters of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Morier* (London, 1911), II. 334; Geffcken, "Die Russisch-Französische Allianz und der Dreibund in Geschichtlicher Beleuchtung", *Deutsche Revue*, November, 1892, pp. 161-162.

⁶ Eduard von Wertheimer, *Graf Julius Andrassy* (Stuttgart, 1910-1913), II. 225.

⁷ Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, *Denkwürdigkeiten* (Stuttgart, 1907), II. 107.

tion as a possible factor in his "nightmare of coalitions" would make any accessions to her strength, however insufficient in themselves to cause alarm, significant as adding to her attractiveness in soliciting allies. So it was that Bismarck, either from nervousness or from calculation, fell into the bullying attitude toward France which instilled such deep and bitter resentment into the souls of the Frenchmen of his generation and which contributed largely to keep alive the unholy fires of national hatred between the two peoples. Utterances such as that quoted by Hohenlohe were only too frequent—frequent enough to keep anxiety from ever dying down. The chancellor seemed determined that no French statesman should ever go to bed at night sure of not having to face a crisis with Germany on the morrow.

Anxiety had risen sufficiently high in 1874 over the affair of the mandates of the French bishops—a side-issue of the *Kulturkampf* then well under way. In the spring of 1875 had come a fresh crop of war-rumors, this time in connection with Belgium, which had also had the misfortune to become involved in the ecclesiastical difficulties of the young empire. The French government expressed its uneasiness regarding the general situation when, on March 11, the Duc Decazes drew the attention of Lord Lyons, then British ambassador at Paris, to three incidents of recent occurrence. These were: Germany's note to Belgium, the sharp tone of her communication of it to France, and the publication of an imperial decree prohibiting the export of horses.⁸ The last had come about in consequence of rumors that the French war office had been trying to place large contracts. Disquieting though the impression was which these three incidents made all together, it was still no more than an aggravation of a state of affairs to which Europe had become more or less accustomed; and there was far from being anything in the nature of a real "scare" in the atmosphere.

However, more serious disturbances were not long in making themselves apparent; and it was France herself who dared call up the storm. The military law of March 10, the famous "Law of the Fourth Battalions", was perhaps a salutary and even a necessary measure in completing the organization of the new republic; but to Germany's morbidly excited susceptibilities on such matters it could only spell one thing—that was, preparation for revenge. The Duc de Broglie, who himself voted on the law, writes that no one in the Chamber had any thought of such an interpretation being placed upon it, and that its final form was given it only as the re-

⁸ Newton, *Lord Lyons* (London, 1913), II. 68.

sult of an eleventh-hour amendment designed to provide for the numerous officers who had attained their grades in the recent war. He adds that it was prevented from leading to any material augmentation of the total forces by a further amendment introduced by the minister of finance, which, in consequence of the increase of the number of battalions in a regiment from three to four, cut down the number of companies in a battalion from six to four.⁹ Viewed superficially, the law was certainly a formidable one; and the German military authorities at once calculated an increase in the French forces of 144,000 men. Calculations on the basis of battalions and companies are always more or less uncertain; but the German estimate was undoubtedly pretty wide of the mark. That of the *Avenir Militaire*, which placed the increase at 28,000, is also open to question, but is probably nearer the fact.

The opportunity thus extended to the German military pedants and apostles of the doctrine of preventive war to find in the new law a confirmation of their most pessimistic views was none the less a rare one and was amply improved. Their croakings seem this time to have taken effect even in the highest quarters. The emperor expressed his conviction that France was preparing an attack; and Bismarck, in a long conversation with Hohenlohe, canvassed the various possibilities of coalitions against Germany, displaying particular concern as to an alliance between France and Russia.¹⁰ The war-rumors were also not long in finding their way into the public press, though the interval between the passing of the law and the opening of the newspaper campaign in Germany which followed was of sufficient length to warrant suspicion as to the spontaneity of the articles which appeared. The first gun of this campaign was fired on March 30 by the *Nationalzeitung*, which denounced the "fourth battalion" as a creation *ad hoc*, indicating a sudden effort rather than a desire for normal development. On April 5, the *Kölnische Zeitung* entered into the discussion of France's prospects for alliances, laying the stress upon her hopes in the direction of Austria and Italy. On the 8th all these ideas, combined and greatly reinforced in emphasis, appeared in the famous article of the *Berlin Post* entitled, "Ist der Krieg in Sicht?" This article, couched in the boldest and most authoritative terms, was read with alarm both in and out of Germany, and was at once attributed to the inspiration of the German chancellery. Almost a year later, in the Reichstag, Bismarck disclaimed vehemently all connection with the affair; but

⁹ Albert, Duc de Broglie, *La Mission de M. de Gontaut-Biron* (Paris, 1896), pp. 185-188.

¹⁰ Hohenlohe, II. 152.

this denial, so far from silencing the comment of posterity, met instant contradiction on the spot from his able and fearless critic, Windthorst.⁹ The *Post*, while not one of the most intimate and officially nourished of Bismarck's "reptiles", was nevertheless an organ well adapted to the privateering service of taking up the more dark and casual of his hints and developing them at the risk of incurring official reprimand and disavowal if the outcome proved too embarrassing. Most of the ideas of the article had already appeared in journals the connection of which with the government was even more direct; but this estimate of the situation placed before the public in the form of a definite warning what the others had only ventured to suggest. The comment of the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* which followed on April 11, and of which the source is hardly to be questioned, was far from being calculated to dispel the alarm. The suspicions expressed by the *Post* regarding Austria and Italy were dismissed as groundless; but all its statements with respect to France were fully approved as warranted by the facts. The political correspondent of the *Preussische Jahrbücher* also took the articles as the text of his communication dated April 12, in which he developed at length the danger to Germany constituted by France's latest moves and the justification of eliminating it by war if it continued. "When the moment shall have arrived", he concluded, "for us to place before France the choice between disarmament and war, rests with the Chancellor and Moltke to determine." Accustomed as the world had become to such utterances in German circles, this burst of warlike talk, coming at a moment when the situation was already tense, could not fail to arouse some serious misgivings. Lord Odo Russell, while himself attempting to make light of these fears, reported to his government that most of the other foreign representatives at Berlin felt that war was actually in the air.¹¹

Gontaut-Biron, returning at this moment to his post from a vacation, had to face a situation delicate in the extreme. The question of armaments is one which touches a state in its most vital interests, and in which outside interference is the most highly unwelcome and the most easily conducive to a conflict. The French government was in no position to assume an attitude of defiance, and resigned itself to go as far as possible on the road of conciliation without actually retracting any of the measures which it had adopted. Its ambassador presented himself, on April 15, immediately after his arrival in Berlin, to von Bülow, the foreign secre-

¹¹ Newton, II. 72. Russell to Derby, April 10, 1875.

tary, with the fullest explanations and assurances regarding the effects of the new military law and data establishing the falsity of the alleged contracts of the Ministry of War with German horse-dealers. The secretary declared that his government was completely satisfied on all points and that the fear of war expressed in irresponsible newspapers was wholly illusory, closing the interview with the pious wish that peace might reign between the two countries for a hundred years. In the evening of the same day, the ambassador met the German emperor at a ball and was very graciously received by him, though without any notable expression of opinion on political affairs. The French military attaché, Polignac, was more favored, for it was on this occasion that the emperor addressed to him the remark, "On a voulu nous brouiller", explaining himself by mentioning some of the recent newspaper articles, and concluding firmly that now all was finished and the danger entirely passed.¹²

For the moment the incident appeared, in fact, to have been closed, although the surly tone in which the German press took up the reconciliation was expressive of disappointment rather than of satisfaction. That the political horizon was, however, far from clear was evidenced by the despatch of a second note to Belgium on April 16; and the storm which had threatened France soon proved also never to have been dispelled at all. Only its mutterings, now dying down in the public press, were to renew themselves in another and even more menacing fashion. Hardly a week after Gontaut's interview with von Bülow, he received intimations from various sources that the chancellor was not in the least disposed to allow the matter of his discontent to be forgotten. Some of the most disquieting warnings came from the Austrian embassy, usually so chary in communicating its private views. The Austrian ambassador, Count Károlyi, interpreted the recent newspaper campaign as an admonition to France that she would never be allowed to complete any real preparations for an attack and that, once Germany was convinced such preparations were under way, she would seize her own moment for beginning the war.¹³ The departing military attaché, Count Welsersheimb, expressed his conviction that the German government still held the view that France was going too fast and too far with her military programme, and was determined to put pressure upon her in every possible way to procure a modification in the recent laws.¹⁴ The president of the Council of Bavaria

¹² Dreux, pp. 85-87. Gontaut to Decazes, April 17, 1875.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 190.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 96. Gontaut to Decazes, April 21, 1875.

was still more definite in estimating the situation. In a talk with the French minister, Lefebvre de Béhaine, over Bismarck's designs toward France, he referred first to the Belgian trouble and then added: "To-day he intends to prevent your military reorganization. He is leaving Russia free in the East, and, as she alone can come between him and you, he has tried to disinterest her."¹⁵

It was with these forebodings fresh in his mind that Gontaut-Biron went, on the evening of April 21, to a dinner at the British embassy, where he found himself seated beside the same Radowitz whose journey to Russia in the early part of the year had aroused such apprehensions, and whose intimacy with the chancellor gave weight to all opinions he might express. The conversation inevitably came round to the subject of the relations of the two countries; and Radowitz began to talk—rather freely, it appears, and with a lack of reserve which perhaps justifies Bismarck's later sarcastic remarks about his friend's ability to hold his wine—but with an assurance and a facility of expression which indicated a thorough familiarity with the matter of his discourse and a complete confidence in the official soundness of his doctrine. This doctrine was purely and simply that of the justification of preventive war, the doctrine which has loomed ugly and menacing in Germany's political thought throughout the last half-century, corrupting all confidence in her official faith and sowing everywhere suspicions as to the sincerity of her declarations of peaceful policy toward her sister states. "We can reassure ourselves for the present", said Radowitz, "but for the future we can hardly cease to be anxious. How long will the present last? When does the future begin? It is equally difficult to say." The recent crisis was passed—at least the German government was willing to consider it so; but the press and public opinion of Germany were not to be so easily convinced, nor could one expect that they should be, when the situation was in fact so nearly hopeless of allowing a permanently peaceful settlement. Was it not inevitable that France should attempt the recovery of her lost provinces as soon as she felt herself strong enough to do so?

But if revenge is the inmost thought of France—and it cannot be otherwise—why wait to attack her until she has recovered her strength and contracted her alliances? You must agree that from a political, from a philosophical, *even from a Christian* point of view, these deductions are well grounded and these preoccupations are fitted to guide the policy of Germany.

It was the old argument of the German school, and one that had already been repeated by Bismarck more than once; but its reap-

¹⁵ Daudet, *Bismarck* (Paris, 1916), p. 49.

pearance, propounded by a person of authority in such bold language, on the very morrow of what Germany had officially declared to be a crisis safely passed, could not fail to destroy any confidence the French government might have felt in these assurances. All Gontaut's most passionate refutations of the premises of this doctrine could not move the German diplomat to recede from his pessimistic views regarding the not very remote future of the relations between the two countries.¹⁶

Even the German official world seems to have been startled at the violence of the language of its representative, and it later repeatedly endeavored to attribute the most striking phrases in the report to the imagination of his auditor. On one occasion Bismarck even offered to show Gorchakov the notes made by Radowitz himself of the conversation, which, he said, would prove that no such language could have been used. It is to be regretted that Gorchakov refused to examine this document, although the absence of certain phrases in it would hardly be conclusive evidence against their having been used.¹⁷ Moreover, Gontaut's report coincides remarkably with one sent from Petrograd by General Le Flô, on the very same day, of the language used by Radowitz to the Tsar in developing Germany's views on the French peril.¹⁸ Gontaut-Biron, informed of the efforts of the German government to discredit his veracity, wrote to Decazes, on January 16, 1876, affirming the accuracy of his report in all details and insisting upon the use of the actual expression, "*chrétiennement*", by Radowitz in characterizing his doctrine—the word which the Germans seemed particularly anxious to disclaim.¹⁹ The French ambassador does not stand convicted even of exaggeration in his statements; and Bismarck is left to fall back upon satirical remarks about the weakness of his colleague's head—remarks which tend to strengthen Gontaut's case rather than otherwise.

The French government was not slow to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded it of placing Germany before Europe in the light of a constant menace to peace. The Minister of Foreign Affairs, Decazes, at once sent out copies of Gontaut's report to the diplomatic representatives at all foreign courts with instructions to communicate it as evidence of Germany's future intentions, however

¹⁶ Dreux, pp. 91–95. Gontaut to Decazes, April 21, 1875.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 155; Wemyss, II. 363. [From the latter passage (Gorchakov to Morier, in conversation), it appears that Gorchakov did examine Radowitz's notes, but the author is in France, inaccessible.] [Ed.]

¹⁸ Flourens, p. 300: "*'La religion comme l'humanité', concluait M. de Radowitz, 'oblige l'Allemagne à ne pas laisser la France préparer une revanche éventuelle.'*" Le Flô to Decazes, April 21, 1875.

¹⁹ Dreux, p. 175.

reassuring her recent declarations might appear.²⁰ In the case of Russia, he went considerably further, and sent off, together with the ordinary circular despatch, a special letter to the ambassador at Petrograd, General Le Flô, written in the most moving terms of appeal for support in a situation of imminent danger. He was practically certain that this appeal would not fall upon 'deaf ears, since the Russian government had repeatedly given France to understand that it would not permit her to be crushed or bullied by Germany. Such had been the impression conveyed to Gontaut on his visit to Petrograd a year before and since confirmed upon several occasions and from several quarters. The most recent and striking of these confirmations had come from the Tsar himself only a few days before, when Le Flô, returning to his post at about the same time as Gontaut to Berlin, had placed before Alexander all the evidence then in France's possession as to the hostile intentions of Germany. The Tsar seemed indeed impressed with the gravity of these communications, though he assured Le Flô of the unalterably peaceful attitude of the German emperor and of his own conviction that a war in the immediate future was not a possibility to be considered. His concluding words were: "Do not be alarmed. . . . The interests of our two countries are common, and if, which I refuse to believe, you should some day be seriously threatened, you would know of it very quickly, and", he added after some hesitation, "you would know of it from me."²¹

These assurances, placed side by side with the utterances of Radowitz, gave the French minister a most excellent text for an appeal to immediate action, and he improved his opportunity to the full. The Tsar, he wrote, was now the arbiter of the peace of Europe, and his intervention to prevent a war would undoubtedly be decisive, "*if only it took place in time*". Germany might easily spring a surprise by declaring war without letting him know in time to warn and save France, unless she were clearly notified beforehand that such action would bring swift and certain retribution.

I must have confidence that His Majesty will avenge what will then be an insult to himself, and that he will cover with his sword those who have trusted themselves to his protection. That, my dear General, is the assurance I should like to obtain through you.

The letter closed with the injunction to make the most of the time remaining before the Tsar's departure for Berlin, as this visit would be the ideal moment for a decisive declaration.²² The demand was

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 121-125. Decazes's circular despatch, April 29, 1875.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 121. Le Flô to Decazes, April 15, 1875.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 125-127. Decazes to Le Flô, April 29, 1875.

an extraordinarily bold one and was perhaps even more pressing than the situation at the moment warranted; but Decazes had seen his opportunity and taken advantage of it to prepare for more serious eventualities. It was, in fact, a bold game which he had undertaken to play; but the results of success would be enormous. He would not only evade the threatened alternative of humiliation or war; but he would deal Germany a blow which would shake her omnipotence and which would go far to free his own country from the shadow of dread which enveloped it so closely. On April 29, the letter went forth to do its work.

This initial step in France's counter-attack proved to have been taken actually not a moment too soon. Germany proceeded to follow up the Radowitz interview with a course of conduct and a series of utterances on the part of her public men which fully justified the campaign laid out against her and indicated that the declaration of intentions upon which it was based, while extreme in point of expression, had been correct in point of fact. Attempts at disavowal followed after the discomfiture of her plans; but for the moment her attitude was quite the opposite of reassuring as to the groundlessness of the suspicions aroused against her. During the latter days of April, her representatives in all the capitals of Europe were besieging the governments to which they were accredited with arguments as to the danger with which their country was threatened by the recent armaments in France.²³ Such communications were certainly not calculated to indicate that Germany was satisfied and intended to push the matter no further. On April 28, the Austrian ambassador, again unbosoming himself to his French colleague, remarked that Bismarck's reassurance did not extend beyond the immediate present—an opinion coinciding remarkably with that of Radowitz.²⁴ On May 7, the Belgian minister at Berlin, Baron Nothomb, informed Gontaut of two conversations he had had in the preceding month with Bismarck and Moltke. The chancellor had declared that the French armaments were certainly in excess of her permanent ability to support them and must inevitably result either in some immediate military enterprise or in a speedy reduction. The irascible field-marshal had been even more emphatic, declaring that attempts to explain away the effects of the new French law were rubbish, and that it could not possibly mean anything but a preparation for war. "In that case", he added, "we ought not to wait until France is ready; but our duty is to anticipate her."

²³ Communicated to Gontaut by Lord Odo Russell, Dreux, p. 163.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

The war, he went on further to say, would probably be within a year, unless the other powers could induce France to recede from the measures she had taken.²⁵ All these opinions indicate that Germany was still highly discontented at France's evident determination not to cease being a military power, and had in mind some action or other toward obliging her to abandon the reorganization of her forces which she had just undertaken.

Germany's next step in that direction was of a still more serious character than those which had preceded it. Up to the end of April she had communicated her views of the situation to foreign courts and to foreign representatives at Berlin, and she had disclosed them unofficially and indirectly to France; but as yet nothing had passed between the two countries through official channels other than the honeyed assurances with which Bülow had been plying Gontaut ever since the latter's return to Berlin. On May 5, however, Prince Hohenlohe presented himself before the French minister of foreign affairs with a communication which rang quite differently from those which had gone before. Additional importance was attached to the communication by the fact that Hohenlohe had already taken leave of Decazes on the eve of his departure for a short absence from his post and had returned for the sole purpose of acquainting him, before leaving Paris, with the contents of a despatch which had just arrived. Von Bülow had written that "the optimism of M. de Gontaut appeared to him exaggerated, that the German government was not entirely convinced of the inoffensive character of the French armaments", and that, while no hostile intentions seemed apparent *at the moment*, "the German General Staff considers war against Germany as the ultimate object of those armaments, and so looks forward to their consequences".²⁶ By way of attenuating the rudeness of this declaration, the ambassador closed the interview by reading a letter from Bismarck, full of the rosiest hopes for good relations between France and Germany on the basis of their understanding over Spanish affairs; but he went away leaving the impression which his visit was doubtless intended to convey, that France was not to be allowed to rest secure in the belief that the incident of the "fourth battalions" was closed, but must consider further action upon it by Germany possible at any time.

Decazes was not panic-stricken by this turn of events. On the contrary, he had foreseen the possibility of it for a fortnight and had laid plans for meeting it the success of which was already prac-

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 104-107. Gontaut to Decazes.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 108-111. Memorandum by Decazes.

tically assured. His letter to Le Flô, now justified by the facts, had attained the results toward which it was directed. The general, immediately after its receipt on May 3, had hastened with it to the Russian chancellor, who insisted that the situation demanded complete frankness and that the letter be communicated to him in its entirety. The passage regarding the protection of the imperial sword, he said, was a trifle strong; but he would leave it as it stood. He retained the letter, together with the other papers which Le Flô had brought, for communication to the Tsar; and returned them the following morning with a note stating that the emperor "has charged me to thank you for this proof of confidence" and that His Majesty would give his reply in person. The audience followed shortly afterward; and the reply turned again upon the French minister's striking phrase. "You ask me", said the Tsar, "to engage to draw the sword for you. No, I shall not draw it, nor will you either; we shall manage without that. I am going to Berlin, and I promise you to put an end to the matter."²⁷ The telegram reporting these two interviews had reached the hands of Decazes shortly before the ill-omened visit of the German ambassador, and contributed notably toward enabling him to receive with equanimity the tidings which that diplomat had brought. His measures were already under way; and he had even got a step ahead of Bismarck by his timely representations to the Russian court.

In consequence of being thus forestalled, the real projects of the chancellor never got a chance to come to a head—happily for the peace of the world, perhaps, but to the great perplexity of those who seek to get at the truth of the affair. That there were projects of some sort is certain. Hohenlohe's declaration was hardly to have been left simply hanging in the air, followed by no action on Germany's part. The day before it was delivered, Dr. Geffcken wrote to Sir Robert Morier that he was sure Bismarck had made plans to turn the visit of the Russians to account by convincing the Tsar of the reality of the danger from France and securing his support in a demand that the French military establishment be reduced.²⁸ On that same day, May 4, Bismarck himself had taken the significant step of addressing to the emperor one of his periodical requests for retirement which constituted a well-known means of persuasion at moments when the chancellor was particularly anxious to have his way. The first draft of this letter had indeed been prepared as long ago as February,²⁹ while the Radowitz project was

²⁷ Flourens, pp. 302-303. Le Flô to Decazes, May 4, 1875.

²⁸ Wemyss, II. 338-339.

²⁹ Horst Kohl, *Bismarck-Jahrbuch* (Berlin, 1894-1899), I. 87-88.

still in the balance; another occasion for its employment had now arrived. Moreover, the peculiar condition was now appended that the emperor should for the moment keep the matter to himself, "in order that the alteration may not be connected by common report with the approaching imperial visit, and other grounds attributed to it than the state of my health".³⁰ Decidedly something was in the wind; and Bismarck foresaw at least that the coming of Alexander to Berlin was to have some consequence for him which warranted measures for insuring his sovereign's favor in advance.

The effort was a failure, except in so far as it may have operated to shield him from reprimand for the steps he had already taken toward an object to which the emperor was unalterably opposed. During all this time the aged monarch had been resting quietly at Ems in practical ignorance of the turn which affairs had taken since his reassuring utterances to the French representatives after the incident of "Krieg in Sicht"; but he was now already in motion. He was on his way back to Berlin, fully determined to demolish any possible designs in the direction of war. Some inkling of the actual situation had been given him at Wiesbaden, where he had halted for a visit to his daughter, the grand duchess of Baden;³¹ and of this fact Bismarck may quite possibly have been aware when he penned his "resignation". Whether the chancellor might not still have carried his point is a question; but just at this moment the effect of Decazes's appeal to Russia for the first time appears in the affair.

On the same day, May 5, that Emperor William arrived in Berlin, arrived also Count Shuvalov, a very popular person at the German court, who was on his way back to his post at London; and the emperor invited him that evening to dinner. The Russian diplomat regaled his host with the whole story of the Le Flô interview, and repeated the assurances given by Alexander on that occasion.³² After dropping the same information into the ear of Bismarck, who sadly replied that his sleepless nights were already too frequent without hearing such news from a friend,³³ Shuvalov hurried on to London, where he had still further work to do. He had already thrown an obstacle in the way of Bismarck's scheme which for the moment put an end to its progress. Emperor and chancellor had

³⁰ *Anhang zu den Gedanken und Erinnerungen* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1901), I. 254.

³¹ Wemyss, II. 352.

³² Geffcken in *Deutsche Revue*, November, 1892, p. 163; Charles Gavard, *Un Diplomate à Londres* (Paris, 1895), pp. 248-249.

³³ Wertheimer, II. 235. Károlyi to Andrassy, May 15, 1876.

their reckoning at a ministerial conference the following morning; and Bismarck, now on the defensive, was forced back into an attempt to throw the blame upon stock-speculators and the clerical opposition. The move was attended with some success, and it served to divert the sovereign's indignation from the real grounds of the affair.³⁴

The possibility remained to Bismarck of working through Alexander; and some diplomats believed that he still pinned his hopes upon so doing, in spite of the declarations of Shuvalov. On May 7 Morier expressed the belief that such was his intention and that he would have sufficient influence to win the emperor and the crown prince to his side when the moment came.³⁵ It did not come. Russia's response to the appeal of Decazes proved more decisive than he could have dared to hope; for, not satisfied with throwing her own weight into the scale against Bismarck, she also exerted herself in helping him to bring Austria and England to join in her protestations.

The English government had at first shown little inclination to take the affair seriously, and had met rather coldly the advances of Decazes. It had watched closely and with some apprehension the negotiations between Germany and Belgium, but had refused to credit the probability of a breach simply between Germany and France. Even the communication of the Radowitz interview had made little impression; and Lord Derby, then secretary for foreign affairs, had affected to look upon it as directed primarily against Austria—a conception of Bismarck's policy which was widely current in England at the time.³⁶ But the despatches from Berlin within the next three or four days must have operated to shake considerably this indifference, for Lord Odo Russell was informed of the threatening language used lately by Bismarck and Moltke before it was reported to his French colleague.³⁷ The German ambassador, Count Münster, did not hesitate to confirm these statements as representing his government's attitude toward a war for the purpose of anticipating possible hostile action on the part of France. Münster had already made guarded representations to England respecting Germany's present convictions on that score; and Lord Derby was by this time aware of the much stronger ones made in other courts of Europe. He summed up his fears to Lord

³⁴ Wemyss, II. 352-353. Geffcken to Morier, May 24, 1875.

³⁵ Reported by Lefebvre de Béhaine, cited by Goyau in introduction to Béhaine's *Léon XIII. et le Prince de Bismarck* (Paris, 1898).

³⁶ Gavard, p. 241.

³⁷ Newton, p. 74. Russell to Derby, May 1, 1875.

Odo Russell by writing that only the Tsar's intervention could banish the threat of war constituted by Bismarck's attitude, concluding: "I see little other prospect of averting mischief, and if it begins, where is it to end?"³⁸ The realization had forced itself upon him that the situation was actually far graver than had at first appeared.

Decazes did not cease his efforts to drive that realization home. Since the crisis had first begun to take shape, in the days of the newspaper campaign in Germany, he had had in mind a similar campaign of his own—not in the French press, which was without influence anywhere, but in that of England. A proper exposé of Germany's machinations in the *London Times*, he thought, would open the eyes of all Europe to them and rouse against them a universal protest which would effectually kill them off. He had suggested this idea to M. de Blowitz, the Paris correspondent of that journal, as far back as April 15. The correspondent's own narrative of the negotiations which ensued is so obviously retouched and is marked by such grave errors of fact that it is practically worthless in matter of detail; but it is probably correct in its general presentation of the genesis of the article which finally appeared. The undertaking, when first proposed to Blowitz, was too serious to be proceeded with on his own initiative; and he was obliged to refer it to his chief, Mr. Delane. In the period of comparative calm following the declarations made just afterward by the German government, the idea of such an article was necessarily dropped; and it was not revived until after the Radowitz interview. Blowitz relates that he was finally authorized to write it if Decazes would produce some convincing evidence of its foundation, and that Decazes showed him the report of the interview itself. At all events he sent off the article under date of May 4, and it was published on the 6th—just about a month after "Krieg in Sicht".³⁹

The article took the form of a letter from Paris and bore the title, "A French 'Scare'". The object alleged in writing it was to throw the light of publicity on a situation that was generally felt to be menacing, though without widespread knowledge of the details. Those who are well informed, says the writer, concede "that Peace or War is about to depend on the interview of the German and Russian Emperors". The military party in Germany, still dissatisfied with the treaty of Frankfort, has decided that the time has come to remedy its defects and to put an end forever to the possibility of a recovery on the part of France. Only Russia stands in a position

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 75. Derby to Russell, May 3, 1875.

³⁹ Blowitz, *Memoirs* (New York, 1903), pp. 97-103; Sir Edward Cook, *Delane of the Times* (London, 1915), p. 249.

to veto their schemes; and they have been at work since the beginning of the year to persuade her to permit the execution of them.

The plan itself consists in an invasion directed to threaten Paris and to compel the signature of a treaty ceding Belfort to Germany, imposing limitations on the French military establishment, and providing for an indemnity of ten milliards to be paid in installments covering a period of not less than twenty years. The objections of emperor and people to such a project can easily be overcome if its advocates are allowed to go on unhindered with their efforts to put it through. Europe must be roused to the existence of this threat to the general peace and must exact from Germany an unequivocal disavowal of the doctrines which certain of her leading men are thus endeavoring to force upon her.

Such was the gist of the article itself. It was accompanied by an editorial apologizing for its publication on the ground that this very action would serve to discredit the rumors it contained. It is absurd, says the editor, to believe that any responsible German official can seriously entertain such theories, or that the nation as a whole could ever be carried away by what is really only the bravado of military mess-tables. The emperor would certainly not hear of it. "Nor is there any more reason to suppose", he adds, "that the Emperor of Russia would lend his influence to a wanton attack on a State with which he has not the slightest subject of quarrel." He concludes with a reference of obvious application to "Statesmen who place great reliance on the diplomatic value of fear".

This was the message with which the *Times* favored Europe on the morning of May 6. It was received everywhere with concern and with a storm of indignation in Germany. The question of its authorship was something of a mystery and was the subject of much speculation. A popular idea was that of attributing the article to the inspiration of Hohenlohe, on the ground that he hoped thereby to be the means of sparing his country the consequences of a possible rash move. This was the explanation advanced by Decazes, apparently as the one best designed to divert attention from himself.⁴⁰ The prince repudiates the connection in his memoirs, though admitting that he knew of the article while it was in preparation.⁴¹ That Blowitz was the writer is a matter beyond all doubt; and it is almost equally certain that his source of inspiration was Decazes. As for the main object in view, it is to be found probably in the references directed at the Emperor of Russia as the person to clear up

⁴⁰ Dreux, pp. 131-132, note.

⁴¹ Hohenlohe, II. 157.

the whole situation—an opinion in which the editor is careful to concur while affecting to detract from the force of all the other conclusions. Decazes had considered from the first the possibility that Alexander, when he came to the point of speaking out, would hesitate to inflict upon Germany the humiliation which his warning would convey and would decide to pass the matter over in silence after all. He could hardly do so, once the attention of the world had been called to it in so striking a manner. The article was, of course, written before the advent of Shuvalov in Berlin and was published before any report of his doings there had got out. Its publication also served a further purpose in making easier any step which the British government might later feel itself called upon to take; and it is only reasonable to suppose that some of the officials must have had knowledge of the negotiations which preceded its appearance and must have favored it on that account.

The disquieting reports which had been multiplying themselves in the few days preceding the appearance of the article received, on that very day, a notable augmentation. Gavard, the French chargé d'affaires, now came to Derby with the despatch containing Hohenslohe's communication to Decazes. The secretary still took the attitude of refusing to credit the attribution of such a plot to Bismarck; but his tone was much less assured than before. "Such an aggression", he admitted, "would arouse in Europe universal indignation; and this sentiment would be nowhere stronger than in England." When Gavard spoke of the possibility of preventing it, Derby answered: "You may rest assured that the government will not fail in its duty." He expressed the hope that the visit of Alexander would accomplish the desired object, whereupon Gavard returned to the charge, insisting that the effect of the Tsar's remonstrances would be more than doubled by the support of a disinterested power.⁴²

Derby was evidently more impressed than his language indicated by this new proof of perfidious designs on Bismarck's part and by the necessity of taking prompt measures to prevent their realization. Two days later, on May 8, he sent off a circular despatch to the British representatives at all the great Continental capitals, instructing them to use all their efforts toward bringing to an end the misunderstanding between France and Germany.⁴³ The step was a sufficiently non-committal one and would not necessarily bring England to taking a public stand against Germany's suspected intentions; but the government could hardly go further without ascertaining beforehand that it would not be acting alone in so doing.

⁴² Gavard, pp. 241-244.

⁴³ Newton, II. 78.

Only information regarding Russia's contemplated protest was necessary in order to induce more decided measures; and this information Gorchakov did not fail to supply.

Gorchakov was also, no doubt, unwilling to appear entirely alone in the matter, and was aware of the tremendously heightened effect which would be produced by converting into simultaneous action the support and approval which his declarations might receive from other courts. This co-operation on the part of England he had taken all possible pains to secure through Shuvalov, who arrived in London on the very day of the first British despatch. His mere announcement that Russia intended to act would probably have been sufficient; but, according to information which later reached Decazes, he was authorized to go even beyond that, and to communicate assurances from his government regarding the affairs of Asia which would remove England's fears of a conflict there, and any possible consequent hesitation about risking the friendship of Germany.⁴⁴ Action so energetic as this offers some indication of how seriously Russia regarded the affair with which she was dealing. The effort was not made in vain, for on the following day, May 9, Derby telegraphed again to Lord Odo Russell, instructing him to support by the most energetic declarations all counsels which the Russians were to pronounce in Berlin.⁴⁵

England's was not the only sanction which Russia had secured. Of all the countries of Europe, Austria was the one which felt the greatest need of circumspection in taking a step of this sort, because of the importance to her of keeping on good terms with her powerful neighbor. Yet, in view of her position as a member of the *Dreikaiserbund*, her attitude would be of great importance; and Alexander did his best to assure her support, keeping the Austrian ambassador informed of the communications of Le Flô.⁴⁶ Count Károlyi was finally instructed to make some representations to Bismarck, which he did at about the time of Emperor William's return to Berlin.⁴⁷ After having taken this action, Austria would have found it embarrassing to return to the charge upon the invitation sent out by Derby on May 8, so Andrassy declined this new request.⁴⁸ Not completely satisfied, however, as to Károlyi's zeal,⁴⁹ he authorized Alexander, in presenting his views at Berlin, to say

⁴⁴ Dreux, p. 137. Decazes to Gontaut.

⁴⁵ Gavard, p. 245; told him that evening by Lord Derby.

⁴⁶ Édouard Simon, *L'Allemagne et la Russie au XIXe Siècle* (Paris, 1893), p. 266.

⁴⁷ Reported to Gontaut by Lord Odo Russell, Dreux, p. 169. Gontaut to Decazes, June 1, 1875.

⁴⁸ Wertheimer, II. 232.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, II. 230.

that he spoke also in Austria's behalf.⁵⁰ He thus avoided implicating himself directly before Bismarck, and yet contrived to add Austria's influence to the declarations which the Tsar was about to make.

The combined attack upon Bismarck's position, which was to burst upon him with such startling unexpectedness and such overwhelming effect, was indeed so admirably co-ordinated and carried out in so theatrical a fashion, as almost to warrant his furious allegations that it was all a comedy prepared long in advance. In fact, it had taken shape only within the space of a week, thanks to the energetic activities of persons justly alarmed at his conduct and utterances during and previous to that time. So fast did events move that the French government, which, had there been a plot, would have known its details and have been sure of what was to happen, remained up to the last moment in ignorance of the concert which had been formed. How far Decazes was from being confident as to the outcome of the approaching interview at Berlin is indicated in the instructions sent off by him to Gontaut on May 8. They were based almost entirely upon the supposition of the success of Bismarck's efforts with Alexander. The ambassador was to assure the Tsar unequivocally, unconditionally, of France's intention to keep the peace. He was to insist that all her armaments were designed solely for defense, and for the insuring of the maintenance of peace in collaboration with Russia. He should promise, if necessary, that France would take no action whatever except with the Tsar's approval. Under no circumstances, however, was he to be the first to pronounce the word "disarmament", even for the purpose of refuting the idea. If it should be pronounced, he was to express astonishment at such interference and was to call attention to the fact that England had declared Germany's fears to be pretexts. He was to say that he must first refer to his government for instructions, and was to affect to consider the proposal as applying to Germany also, in proportions to be determined by a third party, thus suggesting to Alexander the assumption of the rôle of arbiter of the peace. Decazes admitted that such a suggestion might lead to embarrassing results, but he considered it worth trying as a last resort if Alexander failed to take definitely the side of France.⁵¹ The instruction is on the whole a diplomatic masterpiece, as well as an indication of the writer's state of mind with respect to the coming events. Happily the more threatening contingencies for which it provided never arose.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, II. 233; Newton, II. 77, Russell to Derby, May 8, 1875; Wemyss, II. 362.

⁵¹ Dreux, pp. 139-145.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.—15.

On Monday, May 10, the Russian imperial party arrived in Berlin with far more resolute intentions than Decazes had imagined. On the same day Lord Odo Russell presented the communication from London. The British ambassador appeared first on the scene, treating Bismarck to an admonition in the sense of the instructions sent out by Derby on the 8th, which had been obliged to wait over Sunday. Bismarck expressed surprise and hastened to state that his relations with France were never better and that no importance should be attached to the loose talk of newspapers and irresponsible military men.⁵² Germany, he gaily remarked, could never seriously fear the French, regarding whom his slogan should always be, not "Up and at them!" but "Let them come on!"⁵³ To this sally Russell coolly rejoined: "Then why all these observations you have charged your agents to make to the cabinets where they are accredited, calling attention to the French armaments, the danger they present, and the necessity of opposing them?" To this question, which displayed rather too intimate an acquaintance with his recent moves, the chancellor found no reply. He brought the interview quickly to a close, declining England's offer of good offices to end the misunderstanding which he declared had never existed.⁵⁴

After bidding the ambassador good-bye—doubtless in no very agreeable frame of mind—Bismarck was allowed no time to chew the cud of his reflections. Lord Odo Russell was hardly outside the door when he met Prince Gorchakov, bound upon an errand similar to that of which he had just acquitted himself. The prince seized upon the ambassador and bore him back into the terrible presence as a witness of the first words of the memorable interview of the two chancellors. "My dear Bismarck", began Gorchakov, addressing his former pupil in diplomacy, "now don't get nervous. You have in you two Bismarcks—one that is really you and that I like, and the other a nervous and excitable Bismarck." As soon as possible after this extraordinary greeting, which hardly promised a comfortable sequel, Lord Odo took his leave for the second time, but only after informing the unhappy Bismarck that his government concurred in all the observations which the Russian chancellor was about to present.⁵⁵ What passed further between the two is uncer-

⁵² Dreux, p. 137.

⁵³ Wertheimer, II. 236. Károlyi to Andrassy, May 15, 1875.

⁵⁴ Dreux, p. 138; from Gontaut's notes of conversations with Lord Odo Russell, May 22 and July 15, and Béhaine's despatch concerning a conversation, September 10.

⁵⁵ Wertheimer, II. 236. Károlyi to Andrassy, May 15, 1875. Geffcken in *Deutsche Revue*, November, 1892, p. 164.

tain as neither let much of it get out afterward; but Bismarck seems to have flattered the old man and played upon his sympathy by asking ruefully if he had come to pronounce the *quos ego* and by an affected tractability in listening to his somewhat pompous advice. At least, Gorchakov reported the next day to Gontaut that he had received the most satisfactory assurances regarding Germany's intentions; and the manner in which he cautioned France against allowing too free a rein to Ultramontanist activities indicated that Bismarck had even succeeded in turning his attention away from the question of armaments.⁵⁶ The German chancellor had, however, refused the request—which indeed went rather too far—to put any of these assurances in categorical form, as to do so would have been an admission of having entertained the designs of which he was trying to exculpate himself.⁵⁷ The step would have been a superfluous humiliation, for Bismarck's discomfiture was complete, and he was powerless to go ahead with his projects in the face of the disapproval of all his neighbors. He was obliged to give in, though he did so with sufficiently bad grace.

The meeting of the chancellors had its counterpart between the two emperors, though under circumstances of much less strain, since Emperor William already shared the sentiments which his nephew had come to express. He pronounced the Radowitz doctrine to be a most hateful and dangerous one, and one by which he would never allow himself to be swayed. Alexander was able later to confirm fully the assurances given Gontaut by Gorchakov that the crisis was completely passed. He repeated to the ambassador the promise he had formerly made to Le Flô that he would be the first to warn France of any similar developments in the future, adding significantly again: "We have common interests and we ought to remain united."⁵⁸ The bold action of Decazes had borne fruit beyond all expectations.

There followed upon these interviews the celebrated incident of Gorchakov's circular telegram, beginning, according to Bismarck's account, with the words, "*Maintenant la paix est assurée*"—that is to say, thanks to Russia's intervention.⁵⁹ The story has been repeated by a score of writers, all of them basing their accounts on the same source and none of them being able to offer a complete text of the message. The matter is not of vital importance—the phrase would have come nearer the truth than Bismarck was willing

⁵⁶ Dreux, pp. 145-149.

⁵⁷ Wertheimer, II. 237; Newton, II. 79.

⁵⁸ Dreux, pp. 150-154.

⁵⁹ *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, II. 174.

to admit; but M. Dreux has taken the pains to look into it. He produces a circular telegram to the Russian diplomatic representatives, dated May 13, which reads: "The Emperor of all the Russias leaves Berlin, perfectly satisfied as to the sentiments which there prevail and which assure the maintenance of peace."⁶⁰ This wording puts rather a different face on the affair. Was there an earlier message in the sense quoted by Bismarck? The supposition is a possible one; but, on the other hand, since his information could have reached him only by indirect channels, it is also quite possible that his version is incorrect. The further details of Bismarck's indignant and satirical attack upon Gorchakov for sending this telegram, of the latter's guilty silence, and of the Tsar's disavowal of his chancellor's proceedings, are at any rate obvious elaborations for the benefit of the reader. No doubt Alexander did humor Bismarck as far as possible after the incident was closed; and he may even have told him, as the chancellor relates, not to take too seriously the "senile vanity" of Gorchakov. Having accomplished what he had come to do, Alexander could afford to pass the matter off lightly.⁶¹

Just as the imperial party was leaving Berlin another incident involving the telegraph arose. The newspapers of Stuttgart suddenly published a telegram from the Tsar to his sister, the Queen of Württemberg, in the astounding words: "L'emporté de Berlin donne des assurances formelles de paix." The expression, so little befitting the dignity of both correspondents, was probably only the result of the false rendition of an abbreviated message running, "(J')emporte de Berlin", etc.,⁶² but no one failed to recognize the application of the wording mistakenly employed. Bismarck himself doubtless discovered the mistake; but his exasperation over the fact that such an epithet could have been thought possible, remained, none the less, almost as great as that over his actual defeat.

The effect of the combined remonstrances which had been made in Berlin proved completely satisfactory. Of the threat to peace constituted by France's military preparations nothing more was heard. The German newspapers joined in a chorus of peace and vied with each other in finding scapegoats for the rumors of war. The *Reichsanzeiger's* denial of the official representations reported to have been made by Germany to foreign courts was characterized in particular by Lord Odo Russell as "unheard-of audacity".⁶³ The government was not behind in its assurances. Bismarck him-

⁶⁰ Dreux, p. 166.

⁶¹ *Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, II. 174-175.

⁶² Dreux, pp. 166-167.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 163.

self maintained a surly reserve; but the emperor charged Hohenlohe, on his return to Paris, with the most friendly greetings to President MacMahon. "Tell him", he said, "that you are not the only herald of peace, but that the true one stands here."⁶⁴ Meeting Gontaut some days later at the opera, William approached him with the question: "Has peace been made between us?" He spoke further in much the same words as he had employed in the Polignac interview of a month before, venting his especial displeasure against the press.⁶⁵

The question of responsibility had ceased greatly to matter for the moment; the important fact was that the danger had passed. This fact was fully appreciated everywhere, and nowhere more so than among the diplomats at Berlin, almost all of whom expressed their relief and gratification to Gontaut-Biron.⁶⁶ It only remained for the French ambassador to meet personally with the chancellor in order to close the official discussion of the incident. Gontaut was himself anxious to get through with this painful duty; but Bismarck, who afterwards had the effrontery to refer to the long delay as a proof of Gontaut's troubled conscience,⁶⁷ eluded all efforts to see him and finally made his escape to Varzin, where he remained until December.⁶⁸

During his absence, the emperor took up the discussion in another quarter. Wounded by Lord Derby's declaration before the House of Lords, on May 31, that the British government had taken its action in consequence of statements from high sources regarding Germany's intentions,⁶⁹ he addressed himself directly to Queen Victoria to refute the imputation. He assured her that his government could have had no connection with the statements in question, which were at most the expressions of private opinion on the part of military theorists such as Moltke. The queen replied in a letter which has sometimes been connected erroneously with the events of May 10, that she was unwilling to go further into the subject, but that she was sure it could easily be proved that England's alarm had not been exaggerated, as it had been caused by the language both of Germany's representatives abroad and of other persons holding high posts in Berlin. William only answered by regretting that she did not make her accusations more precise. When Bismarck was

⁶⁴ Hohenlohe, II. 156.

⁶⁵ Dreux, p. 157.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 164.

⁶⁷ Hohenlohe, II. 171.

⁶⁸ Dreux, pp. 174-176. Gontaut to Decazes, June 16, 1875.

⁶⁹ Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*, 1875, CCXXIV. 1097.

informed of this correspondence, early in August, he was highly irritated that the emperor had not taken a firmer stand in regard to the origin of the rumors of war. He admitted, however, that Count Münster had made statements in London similar to those of Moltke, though urging that he had done so only by way of academic discussion. None of these letters had any political consequences, since they were exchanged only after the incident was closed; but they give an interesting indication of how seriously England had finally taken the alarm.⁷⁰

On December 31 took place the long-deferred interview between Bismarck and Gontaut-Biron, the last and most distressing scene of the affair. The chancellor undertook from the start to cover the weakness of his position by taking the high hand and by so overwhelming the ambassador with the flood of his indignation that the latter must in spite of himself be forced to appear in the wrong. Gontaut met this attempt to place him in the position of a culprit before his judge with quiet assurance, never lowering his eyes, speaking as little as possible, and evading all essays at cross-examination by the generality of his replies. Bismarck threshed the whole matter out from beginning to end, finding only low intrigue and malice everywhere except in his own spotless conduct. What rankled most deeply was the blow which had been dealt to public confidence in the peacefulness of his intentions. "My protestations will be in vain now", he said, "no one will believe me". Gontaut received the whole tirade with patience and for the most part in silence. Upon only one point did he venture into active contradiction—that was when Bismarck broached the subject of his supposed visit to Russia during the preceding winter. Gontaut at once protested that the statement involved an error of an entire year; and when the prince accused him of bad memory, recalled the fact that he had been summoned to France by the death of his son-in-law at the period Bismarck had in mind. Bismarck found nothing further to reply, nor did he rise to the occasion when Gontaut purposely recurred to the matter later on. The field of objects for Bismarck's invective finally became exhausted, and the interview drew to a close. Gontaut rose to take his leave, saying that France's very anxiety had been the best proof of her innocence, and that he was only the more reassured and delighted to learn that her fears had been exaggerated. His host accompanied him to the door with the plaintive reflection: "Virtue is indeed useless, quite useless", to which he made the comforting reply that nothing is more useful and

⁷⁰ *Anhang zu den Gedanken und Erinnerungen*, I. 256-259. Emperor to Bismarck, August 6, 1875; Bismarck to emperor, August 13, 1875.

gratifying to the conscience. The two parted with pious wishes for the future.⁷¹

Bismarck had managed by sheer force of bluster to maintain his position of injured innocence; but he had not convicted his opponents of either trickery or error. Gontaut, secure in the knowledge that nothing was to be gained by pressing an argument over past events, had contented himself with weathering the storm. He had not done so without difficulty; for, as he reported to Decazes, his situation had been disagreeable in the extreme, and more than once his patience had come near failing him. "J'y ai eu quelque mérite, mon cher ami", he wrote in a private letter to his chief.⁷² The episode is one of the finest in his career and one in which his conscientious devotion to the painful mission which had fallen to his lot was undoubtedly of greater service to his country than might have been rendered by far more brilliant talents than he possessed.

Whatever plan Bismarck had had in process of development was shattered beyond recall by the events of May 10. The humiliation then inflicted upon him was a fact which might be avenged but which could not be altered. Some possibility remained, however, of clearing himself of the suspicions which would henceforth attach to his policies and which, as he complained to Gontaut, would not soon be forgotten. He had already excused himself before the emperor, and apparently with some success, by casting the responsibility upon the press, the Ultramontanists, and the stock-jobbers.⁷³ An article in the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, on May 13, had added "several petticoats" to this scapegoat list. On February 9, 1876, he undertook similarly to convince the Reichstag, by turning to ridicule the ideas attributed to him by his opponents. He treated the assembly to an ironical version of the speech he would have had to make before it in order to obtain a vote of credit for a war under the recent circumstances. The speech, if freed from certain passages of heavy humor and made under the actual circumstances of war, would undoubtedly have compared favorably in effect with many which have lately been received by that body with thunders of applause, instead of with shouts of laughter, as was this one. As for the blame, it now fell upon certain persons in high places who set up without warrant as political oracles, and whose gossip is accepted by the credulous as genuine information. The reference was here obviously to the empress and her circle—the "petticoats" already mentioned—but, as Gontaut remarked, there were several

⁷¹ Dreux, pp. 178-184. Gontaut to Decazes, January, 1876.

⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 176.

⁷³ Wemyss, II. 355.

German generals and ambassadors, to say nothing of the sovereigns and prime ministers of Russia and England and their representatives, who were left to take their choice of being catalogued with either the false oracles or their dupes. While denying all connection with the alarmist articles in the newspapers, the chancellor admitted that he had not disapproved of them, on the ground that the best way of undoing the designs of a bellicose minority is by giving the general public the alarm as to their intent, which he would surely not have done had the designs been his own.⁷⁴ Windthorst demolished both terms of this self-contradictory statement by pointing out some of the circumstances which warrant the belief that Bismarck was involved in the newspaper campaign, and by remarking, that in his experience with the criminal classes, he had noticed that the first person to give the alarm of fire was frequently the one who had applied the match.⁷⁵ Bismarck's general declarations of peaceable intentions on his part were unfortunately contradicted by too many of his own previous declarations, while no one doubted his ability to persuade the emperor to follow his views once he had cleared all other obstacles from his path.

On the whole, this attempt to re-establish his credit with contemporaries was not a success, and Bismarck seems more or less to have abandoned hope in this direction. Only after his retirement did he return seriously to the charge, incorporating in his memoirs and in conversations with his satellites a series of observations destined, if not completely to convince posterity, at least so to befog the issue as to leave him a margin of doubt. The version which he chose to present under his own name was the boldest among several possibilities—namely, the one that the whole affair was the result of a plot between Gontaut and Gorchakov. The theory breaks down at once when it is applied to the facts. By no stretch of argument can such an intrigue be made to explain, for example, Hohenlohe's conversation with Decazes. Moreover, Bismarck has failed to preserve to himself even the virtue of consistency. In 1892 he confided to Dr. Blum that there had been a movement toward war in 1875 on the part of the German General Staff, which he had only succeeded in heading off by resorting to roundabout means.⁷⁶ The remark had reference to a startling theory first put forward in 1878

⁷⁴ *Die Politischen Reden des Fürsten Bismarcks* (Stuttgart, 1892-1905), VI. 342-344; *Stenographische Berichte über die Verhandlungen des Deutschen Reichstages* (1876), pp. 1327-1332.

⁷⁵ *Stenographische Berichte* (1876), p. 1333.

⁷⁶ Johannes Penzler, *Fürst Bismarck nach seiner Entlassung* (Leipzig, 1897-1898), IV. 199.

by Blowitz in the *Times*,⁷⁷ and to which the chancellor had already given his sanction through his faithful Busch.⁷⁸ According to this novel and ingenious explanation, Bismarck had set all Europe by the ears and brought upon himself one of the greatest humiliations of his career simply in order to circumvent the machinations of these unwelcome meddlers in his foreign policy. The picture of the all-powerful chancellor reduced to such a pass is one which the imagination cannot seriously entertain, nor does the theory account for his resentment at the intervention he is credited with having himself invoked. It only adds another element of inconsistency to Bismarck's already weak position and indicates further the impossibility of establishing the innocence of his motives.

In direct opposition to the theories based upon Bismarck's entire innocence of warlike designs, stands the view advanced by several reputable writers—among them, Dr. Geffcken—that he was deliberately manoeuvring toward a war with France.⁷⁹ Such a supposition goes contrary to none of the facts of the case, except the fact that he did not promptly succeed before he was interfered with. The Bismarckian method of bringing on war, as established by precedents, was a good deal bolder and more decisive than the procedure in 1875. The explanation, if not wholly rejected, must be at least somewhat modified to appear complete.

Between the two attitudes of wolf and lamb, there is, in fact, a whole range of intermediate possibilities. That Bismarck was pushed on against his will by the military party is as improbable as that he had resorted to a ruse in order to defeat its plans. Lord Derby, in justifying his government's action before the House of Lords, put forward the suggestion that both France and Germany were jointly responsible—that each was pushing the other on, since each was laboring under misunderstandings as to the intentions of the other which only required to be pointed out by friends in order to disappear.⁸⁰ The best proof that this conception was not the one which really actuated the government in its dealings is the fact that it directed its counsels to only one of the parties and that it presented them in extraordinarily emphatic fashion. Still another explanation which has met with some favor is that, while Bismarck was doing no more than continue with his ordinary policy of bullying France in order to keep her policy unsettled by constant in-

⁷⁷ Blowitz, p. 114; adhered to in his *Memoirs*.

⁷⁸ Moritz Busch, *Unser Reichskanzler* (Leipzig, 1884), I. 276.

⁷⁹ *Deutsche Revue*, November, 1892, p. 161.

⁸⁰ Hansard's *Parliamentary Debates*, 1875, CCXXIV. 1097-1098, speech of May 31.

timidation, Decazes had in this instance detected and seized an opportunity to trip him up.⁸¹ The supposition here is that Decazes took advantage of certain indiscretions on Bismarck's part in order to place specifically before Europe the alternative between equilibrium and German domination, with the result of shaking seriously Bismarck's hitherto unquestioned power to do as he pleased with France, and of taking a long step toward gaining the friendship of Russia. The objection at once arises, that the indiscretions which gave Decazes his chance were indeed so very grave as to indicate that Bismarck was pushing his policy this time far beyond any mere suspended threat. Is it possible, asks the Duc de Broglie, that Hohenlohe's denunciation of the French armaments was intended to be followed by only passive resignation if France failed to heed the warning?⁸²

The answer has already been shadowed forth at more than one point in the course of development of the affair. It was advanced as a possibility by Gontaut, in a despatch of April 24,⁸³ and it was the basis of the instructions drawn up for him by Decazes on May 8.⁸⁴ Essentially it is that Bismarck was working by all means in his power to procure the repeal of the laws which France had just passed, and that he was prepared to go to great lengths to accomplish his purpose. This is the view taken by de Broglie, Hanotaux, and Dreux, on the foundation of the Gontaut correspondence. It is supported by too many facts to permit of escape even by drawing no conclusion at all. Passing over the Radowitz mission, which preceded the passage of the French military law but which was undoubtedly undertaken with a view to providing for some such eventuality, and also over the other alarming incidents of the early spring, we still have a formidable series of occurrences to account for after March 12. The first of these is the violent outcry in the German press, Bismarck's connection with which can scarcely be doubted. Then followed the extraordinary statements of Radowitz, which were echoed by Moltke, by Münster, and by Bismarck himself. A still further development was constituted by Germany's representations to foreign governments regarding the dangerous character of the French armaments. Finally came Hohenlohe's declaration to Decazes that his government had not changed its opinions on that subject. We have also to consider Bismarck's offer of resignation, coming at so significant a moment and framed in

⁸¹ Wertheimer, II. 238.

⁸² Broglie, pp. 226-227.

⁸³ Dreux, p. 98.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 139-140, 194.

such noticeable terms. All these are facts, which have been disputed but which have not been disproved, and which certainly indicate the development of some definite design. The most reasonable interpretation of that design is that it was to place before France the demand for at least a partial disarmament.

The Duc de Broglie asserts that such a demand would have had as its inevitable consequence war, since no ministry could have survived by an hour the proposal to comply with it made before the Chamber of Deputies.⁸⁵ M. Dreux rejects this conclusion on the ground of Bismarck's skill in covering his operations.⁸⁶ He was carefully avoiding the presentation of a direct demand and endeavoring to bring it forward through a third power in the form of its friendly advice, or to procure the desired effect merely by making it appear that all Europe joined him in regarding France's measures as a threat to peace which ought to be retracted and which Germany was justified in viewing with alarm. By thus keeping out of sight and leaving the issue to be formulated by outside powers, and by the press and the militarists at home, he would avoid coming directly into contact with French public opinion and consequently avoid all danger of provoking war. It is worth noting that the same opinion was advanced by the political correspondent of the *Preussische Jahrbücher* in June, 1875.

The explanation is plausible, but it assumes a great deal that is really unwarranted. In the first place, Bismarck's hand was only too visible throughout the affair. No one in France doubted who was behind the threatened demand of disarmament; and if it had arrived, no one would have stopped to question whence it came. Moreover, had the other powers upon whom Bismarck was counting shown themselves only tolerant, withholding their active co-operation, and had France continued to disregard the handwriting on the wall, is it reasonable to suppose that the chancellor would simply have yielded to the impossibility of carrying out his designs? The supposition is not impossible; but it is much easier to picture a second visit of Hohenlohe with a communication in more definite terms. Finally, we are compelled to consider the fact that Bismarck was playing with fire throughout the entire course of events. There is no question in which one government can less safely interfere than in that of the armaments of another; and it must always recognize the presence of war immediately in the background whenever it undertakes such interference. In vain might Bismarck have sought

⁸⁵ Broglie, p. 228.

⁸⁶ Dreux, pp. 191-202.

to cover his traces; the menace was there. He would have had to rely upon the skill of his adversaries fully as much as upon his own; for, in treading upon such dangerous ground, a single false step on either side might have brought on a conflict, no matter how much against the will of both parties concerned. Bismarck's policy can, therefore, not be acquitted of involving the risk of war.

Bismarck must have realized better than anyone else the element of danger in his project and have gone ahead with it in disregard of that fact. Anxious that France should not again become a considerable military power and a rallying point for alliances which would enable her henceforth to deal with Germany on equal terms, he had determined to remedy, if possible, the deficiency of the treaty of Frankfort in not providing a limitation on armaments; and he was prepared to go even to the length of war in order to carry out his aims. Such must be the conclusion with regard to his conduct in 1875. He was brought up short by timely and decisive action on the part of the other powers and left in a worse position than before. The incident was the first rift in France's hopeless situation and a sign of promise which enabled her to breathe more freely than she had in four years. The re-establishment of the balance of power was in sight. In principle and in results the affair is an important and characteristic phase in the development of German imperial policy, which has so often brought upon itself the very situations it most dreaded and sought to prevent, and which must inevitably have culminated, sooner or later, in the realization of the brutal threat that has always been the mainspring of its action and the fundamental argument for its views.

JOSEPH V. FULLER.

PRUSSIANISM IN NORTH SLESWICK

WITHOUT attempting to recount once more the tangled history of the Sleswick-Holstein question before 1866, it may suffice to remind the reader that the question had been precipitated by the death on November 15, 1863, of Frederick VII., king of Denmark, and by the attempted maintenance by his successor, Christian IX., of a constitution which virtually united Sleswick, but not Holstein, with the kingdom of Denmark; that after a brief war, the Danish king, by the treaty of Vienna (October 30, 1864), surrendered the duchies to the King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria; that, after the Six Weeks' War, the latter by the treaty of Prague (August 23, 1866), yielded his rights to the Prussian king; and that on January 12, 1867, both duchies were formally annexed to the Prussian state.

Apart from the rival dynastic claims of the kings of Denmark and the dukes of Augustenborg, the Sleswick-Holstein imbroglio was essentially a conflict between *Deutschtum* and *Dänentum*. That Sleswick had at one time been Danish admits of little doubt; chronicles, place-names, and runic inscriptions, all give evidence that a thousand years ago South Jutland extended to the Eider River.¹ But at various times during the Middle Ages various German elements, Saxon, Frisian, and from Holstein, made their way north of the Eider, and the Germanization of South Sleswick was begun.² It was not resisted by the Oldenburg kings of Denmark. It was strengthened by the nationalistic movement which arose in Germany after the settlement of 1815, and by the formation, after 1830, of a Sleswick-Holstein party hostile to Copenhagen and urgent for the formation of a separate state, having German as its official speech, and joined to Denmark in the person of a common ruler only.

The reply to the demands of this new faction came almost immediately in a strong Danish revival throughout South Jutland. Realizing that the time had come when they must choose between German and Danish, the intellectual classes began to organize in defense of their native speech. In 1838 the publication of a Danish newspaper, *Dannevirke*, was begun in Haderslev. In 1842 a Danish

¹ For the evidence see F. de Jessen, ed., *Manuel Historique de la Question du Slesvig* (Copenhagen, 1906), pp. 3-73. Cf. Karl Jansen and Karl Samwer, *Schleswig-Holstein Befreiung* (Wiesbaden, 1897), p. 3. Jansen gives the German view.

² De Jessen, *Manuel Historique de la Question du Slesvig*, pp. 69, 93, 95-98.

member of the Sleswick estates, Hjort-Lorenzen, attempted to address the estates in Danish, but German members interposed with furious opposition, and the speech was never completed.³ After the treaty of London (1852) the Danish government, now left in control of both duchies, made definite efforts to stem the tide of Germanization in church and school, which were stoutly resisted by the Sleswick-Holstein party. The language rescripts of 1850-1851 were, perhaps, an error in statesmanship, but they seem to have been an essentially fair arrangement. In South Sleswick, which was bilingual, the two languages were put on a fairly equal footing. The chief criticism of the rescripts appears to be that the boundaries between the linguistic areas were not always accurately drawn.⁴ The situation remained unsettled until the formal annexation of both duchies to Prussia in 1867.

I.

The King of Prussia did not acquire a clear title to the whole of Sleswick by the treaty of Prague; the Emperor of Austria in transferring his rights to the duchies made this important reservation: "that the inhabitants of North Sleswick shall be again reunited with Denmark if they should express such a desire in a vote freely given" (Article V.).⁵

The idea that the proper solution of the Sleswick question was the division of the duchy along the lines of nationality was not new. It was first put forward by Uwe Jens Lornsen, the Frisian agitator, in a letter written in 1832. Since that time division was frequently proposed, occasionally by Danes but more often by Germans; it was also urged by some of the powers in the negotiations preliminary to the treaty of Vienna. But all parties directly concerned rejected the solution. The Danish government stood on its historic rights: Sleswick had been joined to Denmark for at least ten centuries, and to surrender the German part would be to surrender Danish territory. The Sleswick-Holstein party also refused to listen to the suggestion; all of Sleswick was to be included in their new state. The Danes of Sleswick were naturally reluctant to see their country

³ The Danish revival is described in two articles by P. Lauridsen, "Det Nationale Gjennembrud i Sønderjylland", in *Tilskueren*, XV. 261-285, 359-379.

⁴ On the subject of the "rescripts" see de Jessen, *Manuel Historique*, pp. 121-128; Mackeprang, *Nordslesvig* (Copenhagen, 1910), pp. 4-5; P. Lauridsen, "Efter 20 Aars Fremmedherredømme", in *Tilskueren*, I. 829-830.

⁵ For the text of the treaty, in English translation, see Oakes and Mowat, *The Great European Treaties of the Nineteenth Century*, pp. 251-255, or *British and Foreign State Papers*, LVI. 1050.

mutilated, and not till they faced the danger of annexation to Prussia did they agree to accept the proposal.⁶

Unfortunately neither Prussia nor Austria was vitally interested in this part of Article V.; it was owing to the insistence of Napoleon III., who had come forward as mediator, that the reservation found a place in the treaty. But inasmuch as the stipulation was accepted by both contracting parties, it must be construed not only as a pledge on the part of Prussia to Austria, but as a moral obligation on the part of both these powers to the Danes of North Sleswick.

The news from Prague was joyfully received north of the Flensborg-Tönder line, but disappointment soon followed. In the act of annexation which became a law the following January there was not the least hint that North Sleswick was to occupy a peculiar position. Later in the same year a constitutional assembly met to draw up a constitution for the new North German Confederation. In that body North Sleswick was represented in the persons of Hans Krüger and N. Ahlmann. These men took the position that they could not participate in the deliberations, as their territory did not actually belong to the Confederation. This was the beginning of the "policy of protest" in which the Danes persisted for nearly twenty years.⁷

Thus was formed a small political group which till yesterday was a factor in Prussian politics. Its earlier policies, the protest and the refusal to take the oath, for which Krüger was chiefly responsible, were abandoned in the early eighties;⁸ but the political creed formulated by Ahlmann in 1867 remained always the platform of the party: "We are Danes; we wish to remain Danes; we wish to be dealt with as Danes and according to the precepts of the law of nations."

It seems that Bismarck honestly intended that some sort of referendum should be taken at the proper time. In October, 1864, shortly before the peace of Vienna, he stated to Jules Hansen that

⁶ The history of the movement to divide Sleswick is told in detail in de Jessen, *Manuel Historique*, pp. 135-154. See also a letter written in 1864 by a Dane, Chr. Lütken, embodying this proposition, in an article by Heiberg, "Martsforeningen og Planerne om Sønderjyllands Deling", in *Gads Danske Magasin*, XI. 666-668 (August, 1917). On Lord Russell's plan presented to the London conference (1864) see Aage Friis, *D. G. Monrads Deltagelse i Begivenhederne 1864*. Bishop Monrad was Danish prime minister in 1864. His apologia, which casts much light on the diplomatic movements of the time, was written in 1880 but was not published before 1914.

⁷ Mackeprang, *Nordslesvig*, pp. 23, 41-49.

⁸ H. P. Hanssen-Nørremølle, "De Nationale Forhold i Sønderjylland", in *Tilskueren*, IV. 472 (1887). Up to the time of the recent German revolution, Hanssen was a member of the Reichstag.

personally he would earlier have been satisfied with the southern half of Sleswick, but that the king wished to give all to the Duke of Augustenborg.⁹ In December Hansen again had an audience with Bismarck, but now "in case Prussia should return North Sleswick to Denmark", Bismarck was "of the opinion that there would have to be compensation either in the north or in the south".¹⁰ A year later he stated that his view of the question remained the same, but that certain strategic points must be left in Prussian control.¹¹ In the autumn of 1866 Bismarck appears to have looked forward to an early referendum, for in a letter dated October 21 he opposed the introduction of military service into the duchies, because he feared that it would have "an unfavorable effect on the opinion and on the eventual decision (*Abstimmung*) in North Sleswick".¹² On December 20, 1866, Bismarck, in a speech delivered in the Prussian Landtag, outlined the history of Article V., and in the course of this speech made his famous declaration against the expediency of annexing an unwilling population. He added, however, that it would be impossible to divide Sleswick exactly along national lines, but that the terms of the article were vague and "leave us a certain latitude in its execution".¹³

When Krüger, in 1867, protested against the inclusion of North Sleswick in the North German Confederation, Bismarck replied that the pledge of the preceding August would, of course, be carried out; but that the people of North Sleswick were Prussian subjects and had no right to demand a referendum. The Austrian emperor alone had any right to insist on the execution of Article V. But before any step could be taken toward a plebiscite, it would be necessary to negotiate with Denmark so as to secure the rights and economic welfare of the German residents in North Sleswick.¹⁴

In June, 1873, Krüger had a conversation with the chancellor in which the latter stated that he still held to the correctness of the demand for a plebiscite, but that the time was not opportune; he had to consider public sentiment, and he intimated that German opinion was overwhelmingly opposed to any form of territorial cession.¹⁵ But while Bismarck thus committed himself to the principle of a referendum, he never indicated clearly the extent of the ter-

⁹ Jules Hansen, *Les Coulisses de la Diplomatie* (Paris, 1880), p. 35.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

¹² Von Keudell, *Fürst und Fürstin Bismarck*, p. 321.

¹³ Hansen, *Les Coulisses de la Diplomatie*, p. 129; Mackeprang, *Nordslesvig*, p. 22.

¹⁴ Mackeprang, *Nordslesvig*, pp. 41-42.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

ritories that were to be allowed this privilege; and it is probable that the limits intended were far narrower than the true state of the facts would have required.

Meanwhile, in May, 1867, the Prussian foreign office had begun to negotiate with the Danish government on the subject of a possible retrocession of South Jutland; but the guaranties demanded were of such extensive character that the Danish government, though disposed to go to considerable lengths, concluded after a time that it was useless to continue the negotiations. Such guaranties as concerned ordinary civil rights the Danes would gladly give; they were also willing that the Germans who actually resided in the country should have their own churches and select their own pastors and schoolmasters; nor was any great objection raised to the demand that the German language should have equal rights with the Danish in the judicial administration. But the demand that all questions involving the rights of language should be settled on the basis of conditions in 1846, the Danes found entirely unacceptable. As that was the year before Danish really began to assert its rights in South Jutland, a concession on this point would give the German language a position of preference and even of dominance which would be unendurable. In such a case a great deal of the public instruction would continue in German where the Danes were in overwhelming majority, while in the city of Flensburg, where there was a Danish population of some consequence, the Danish language would wholly disappear from public worship.¹⁶

While demanding these conditions, the Prussians were not willing to give much in return. The Danes asked that the referendum be allowed to cover territory of sufficient extent to give Denmark a real national boundary. This would not be difficult to determine. The election of 1867 had shown clearly that the Danes were in overwhelming majority north of a line drawn from Flensburg Fjord northwestward through Tönder and Höjer. North of this line there were exceedingly few precincts in which the German vote exceeded the Danish.

After the failure of the negotiations of 1867 the Danish government was unable to do much toward securing the promised referendum. The men of North Sleswick, however, kept the matter constantly before the authorities by protests, memorials, deputations,

¹⁶ The guaranties are listed in Hansen, *Les Coulisses de la Diplomatie*, pp. 153-160. See also von Sybel, *Die Begründung des Deutschen Reiches*, VI. 190; *Tilskueren*, XXVIII. 183 (September 5, 1911). Elberling states that the guaranties were purposely drawn to provoke a refusal. De Jessen, *Manuel Historique*, p. 308.

pamphlets, and similar means. The agitation was not successful; the deputations were rarely received; the petitions and memorials were promptly consigned to the pigeonhole. Owing to their refusal to take the required oath, the Danish representatives were unable to bring the subject up in the Prussian Landtag; but in the Reichstag Krüger and Ahlmann returned to the subject of Article V. in season and out of season. The last debate on the matter in the Reichstag probably occurred in 1877, when the spokesman of the government affirmed once more that the Danes had no right to demand a referendum.

The following year, 1878, Article V. was annulled; by a treaty concluded October 11, Austria released Prussia from her pledge to South Jutland. It is believed that Austria in this way paid for Prussian support in the Congress of Berlin, that North Sleswick was the price paid for Bosnia.¹⁷ Bismarck was doubtless correct in his analysis of public opinion in Prussia; there was also the difficulty that William I., as a true Hohenzollern, was very averse to yielding a single foot of earth.

When the treaty of October 11, 1878, was published (February 4, 1879) the Danes in South Jutland were dismayed, but they did not give up the struggle. Krüger died in 1881 and new leaders arose among them, men like J. Jessen, Gustav Johannsen, and H. P. Hanssen-Nørremölle, who were disposed to accept facts but still to insist on their rights of citizenship. The policy of protest and non-juring was dropped, though only after a severe struggle; and before the close of the eighties, the Danish representatives had taken their places in the Landtag and joined the opposition. In the Reichstag, too, they have been active critics of the government. Among the members who have voted consistently against the budget during the present war has been H. P. Hanssen-Nørremölle, the member from North Sleswick.

II.

The abrogation of Article V. not only brought bitter disappointment to the inhabitants of South Jutland; it also created a situation of great difficulty for thousands of men and women whose civil rights were dependent on the complete enforcement of the pledge given at Prague.

It was provided in the earlier treaty of Vienna that any resident in the duchies who might wish to continue a subject of the King of

¹⁷ It was supposed at the time that the October treaty was a punishment directed at Christian IX. for permitting his daughter to marry the pretender to the crown of Hanover. See de Jessen, *Manuel Historique*, p. 308. Mackeprang accepts the view stated above. *Nordslesvig*, p. 112.

Denmark should have a period of six years in which to dispose of his interests and property and should be allowed to emigrate without hindrance of any sort, provided that he declared his choice of Danish citizenship before some duly authorized official.¹⁸ Those who made this choice were known as "optants". But the act of option was not legally completed and binding before there had been actual emigration. On this point there was no dispute; the question that arose was how to construe the term emigration, the Danes holding that so long as one still had property in Sleswick he had not emigrated, while the Prussian lawyers finally concluded that crossing the border completed the option, if one had earlier declared his choice in legal manner.¹⁹

During the first two years of German occupation very few declared their option; there was plenty of time and it might be safer not to commit oneself too soon. Then came the peace of Prague with the promise of an early referendum, and after that year there seemed to be no reason why one should express a choice. The country would surely be restored to Denmark before the six-year period should expire, and then neither option nor emigration would be necessary.

This delay did not accord with the wishes of the Prussian authorities and steps were soon taken to force the South Jutes to select their citizenship. For this purpose an excellent instrument was discovered in the Prussian military law. In 1866 the Prussian military system, with its demand of three years' compulsory service from all as they reached the age of twenty, was extended to the duchies. The result was that during the autumn of that year nearly all the young men of military age in North Sleswick renounced their Prussian citizenship and declared their intention to remain citizens of Denmark.²⁰

This action was doubtless what the Prussian government had hoped and expected. The next step looked toward ridding the kingdom of these "optants". It was announced (November 16, 1866) that in spite of their declarations the names of all these men would be carried on the service rolls until it should be established that they had taken up a permanent abode in the land of their option. There seemed now to be no choice but to emigrate immediately and the young conscripts began crossing the border in large numbers.

Among the new Prussian subjects were a considerable number

¹⁸ Article XIX.

¹⁹ For a discussion of these varying views see de Jessen, *Manuel Historique*, pp. 230 ff.

²⁰ Mackeprang, p. 60; *Tilskueren*, IV. 472-473 (1887).

of older men who had served in the Danish army and consequently had sworn fidelity to the King of Denmark. In March and April, 1867, all those who had served in this way since 1852 were summoned to roll-call and to take the military oath to the King of Prussia. The men appeared as ordered but with few exceptions they refused to take the oath. The result was that many of them suffered punishment, the favorite penalty being a term of military training amid German surroundings. This led to a second migration, one that took on the appearance of a panic. The chief reason for this undue haste was that war between Prussia and France seemed imminent, and the Danes did not wish to enroll under the Prussian flag.²¹

After the flight of these elder Danes, the Prussian authorities determined to proceed with greater severity against the young conscripts who had declared for Denmark. An order was issued which, if it had been carried out, would have driven Danes in large numbers across the border. It was later withdrawn, however, probably because of protest from Copenhagen. On May 2, 1869, it was announced, that all optants who had fled to evade military service before March 1 of that year, might return and resume their residence in the duchy. During the following months the question of the optants was made the subject of extended negotiations between the Prussian and the Danish government, with the result that an agreement was reached and promulgated December 3 and 20, 1869. In the "December Convention" the government of Denmark conceded the right of Prussia to demand a limited term of service from all who had declared their option *after* they had received their military summons.²²

In the summer of 1870 the Sleswick Danes again found themselves in sore straits. War had broken out with France, but to fight against Napoleon III., the author of the pledge which was very soon to give them liberty, seemed unthinkable. There was but one escape; the young men must declare their option before the order of mobilization should come. But to their great surprise they now learned that the Prussian officials would not receive their declarations, chiefly, it is believed, because it appeared likely that Denmark would join France in the coming war. But, in spite of the fact that emigration to Denmark was now practically forbidden, the conscripts hurried northward in large numbers, evaded the guards on the border, and escaped into Denmark.

²¹ Mackeprang, pp. 60-61.

²² *Ibid.*, pp. 62-64.

These three migrations (in 1866, 1867, and 1870) resulted in much distress and great confusion both in Sleswick and in Denmark. Many of the fugitives had left their property behind in the panic, and the presence of so many refugees in the border communities of Jutland threatened to become a serious economic problem. At the same time the departure of so many breadwinners produced much destitution in the distracted territories south of the border. Now that the war was over many returned to their homes; but they soon discovered that only with great difficulty could they acquire rights of residence on Prussian soil. It was also a question what duties these people owed to the two governments and also to what extent their options were legal. The whole matter grew daily more confused. Finally the governments concerned agreed to have the situation examined by a joint commission, and on the basis of this investigation an agreement was reached at Aabenraa (1872) which it was hoped would remove all the difficulties.

The conclusions of the Aabenraa convention may be grouped under three principal heads. (1) The commission determined the status of something more than one thousand men who had fled to Denmark to avoid mobilization. The greater number of these, nearly two-thirds, were given the status of Danish citizens. The remainder were classified as Prussian subjects, and they were later punished for having failed to appear at muster. (2) The commission also provided that optants who wished to return might resume their residence in Sleswick on presenting a certificate of settlement from Danish authorities, and that they might continue in residence so long as they showed no hostility to the Prussian government and did not prove "burdensome". (3) The convention also settled the question of military service by providing that neither country should demand this service from any citizen of the other country. The optants therefore owed their military service to Denmark.²³

The Aabenraa commission found that in many cases the matter of citizenship was difficult to determine; but in such cases the Prussian representatives, "in kindness and as an act of special favor", allowed the decision to favor the optant. But one must not stress unduly these professions of liberality. The situation was such that the rulers in Berlin would gladly have given all the Danes in North Sleswick the status of optants. The optants had no political rights; they took no part in elections, except to a limited extent in church elections; they held no offices. The greater the number of optants, the sooner Prussian control in the duchy would be complete. In

²³ De Jessen, pp. 280-284.

1867 the number of votes cast for the Danish candidates for membership in the Reichstag was 27,448; four years later the number was 21,563. The decrease was doubtless due in part to the disfranchisement of the returned optants; and for a decade longer there was little comfort in the total of the Danish vote.²⁴

In some localities the number of optants was quite large. After the Aabenraa convention they returned from Denmark by thousands. Hanssen-Nörremölle wrote in 1887 that one-tenth of the population of North Sleswick were of Danish citizenship.²⁵ Mackeprang accepts this estimate but adds that in some localities the fraction would run as high as fifty per cent.²⁶ It is clear that under such conditions there would be a material shrinkage in the Danish vote. At the same time the Germanizing party was being steadily recruited from Prussian office-holders and public servants of many sorts. Nevertheless, the Danes have kept control of their communities to a surprisingly large extent.

For a decade the optants suffered very little annoyance, but in 1883 the Prussian returned to the problem. On January 7 of that year an order was issued that all men who were born in 1863 should report for military service. To this was joined the threat that failure to comply might entail banishment.²⁷ In so far as this order concerned the sons of optants, it was in direct opposition to the convention of Aabenraa, in which it was agreed that the optants should perform their military service in Denmark. It is true that the sons of optants born after the ratification of the treaty of cession (November 16, 1864) would not be Danish citizens; but the order of January 7 applied to young men who were born before this date and whose citizenship was unquestionably Danish. Another pledge had been broken and another wave of migration began to roll northward, though in this year the number of exiles was relatively small.

An optant is a resident of South Jutland who at one time chose Danish citizenship, emigrated to Denmark, and later returned to his former home. But by far the greater number of the emigrants never did return. Those who left the country subsequent to November 16, 1870, were permanent exiles; only in rare cases have such men been allowed to resume their residence in Sleswick.²⁸ It

²⁴ Mackeprang, pp. 35, 76; *Tilskueren*, VII. 306-328, for a study of election results, particularly the election of 1890, by Johan Ottosen.

²⁵ *Tilskueren*, IV. 472.

²⁶ Mackeprang, p. 161. See also Erik Givskov, "Germany and her Subject Races", in the *Contemporary Review*, LXXXVII. 820.

²⁷ De Jessen, pp. 287-288.

²⁸ *Tilskueren*, IV. 476 (1887).

is impossible to state how many inhabitants the country has lost through emigration to Denmark (or to America), but the estimates run from 50,000 to 60,000. As the total population of North Sleswick is but little above 150,000, this means a relatively great loss. It is, however, only when one considers the economic effects of such a movement that its extent and significance can be fully realized. It is believed that the economic cost of this migration must be placed at not less than \$25,000,000.²⁹

Among the residents of Sleswick twenty years ago were certain persons who in the sixties had taken steps to determine their citizenship in favor of Denmark but had not completed the act of option; they either had never emigrated or had returned after a short stay across the border. After the passage of more than thirty years the Prussian government suddenly had its thoughts directed toward these men, and soon information came to them that they were suspected of being optants. Many of them could point to active service in the Franco-Prussian war, to participation in Prussian elections, to the fact that they had held public offices, and to the common belief that they were Prussian subjects. But it was all to no purpose; the courts held that a brief stay in Denmark (four days in one case) was sufficient to complete the act of option. During the years 1902 and 1903 the hunt for optants was particularly active; more than a thousand men lost their Prussian citizenship in these two years. This new political sport was a deliberate effort to deprive the Danish population of its native leaders; for in nearly every case it was a man of prominence whose rights of citizenship were called into question. Ugly stories of bribery and perjury followed the progress of this investigation, some of which appear to be only too well founded.³⁰

As time passed on and a new generation grew up in South Jutland, another problem began to demand attention: that of the status of the children of optants. According to Danish law citizenship was dependent on the place of birth; children born outside Denmark, though the parents were Danish subjects, were not Danish citizens. At the same time the laws of Prussia held that a child inherited the political status of the parents; according to this principle the children of optants (born subsequent to the father's option) could not be Prussian citizens. Thus there was growing up in North Sleswick a large and constantly increasing number of children who were with-

²⁹ *Contemporary Review*, LXXXVII. 820; de Jessen, pp. 406-407; Mackeprang, pp. 149-150; *Tilskueren*, IV. 475-476.

³⁰ On the "fabrication of optants" see de Jessen, pp. 418-419; Mackeprang, pp. 242-245; *Nineteenth Century*, LIV. 60-61.

out a country—the so-called *heimatlose*. In 1898 the situation was in part remedied by a change in the Danish law which allowed the children of Danish citizens residing abroad to claim Danish citizenship. But the law could not apply to children born before the date of the statute. (March 19, 1898), and for nearly a decade longer nearly all the children of optants remained “homeless”.

Finally, in 1906, the Prussian authorities found it expedient to take up this question with the Danish foreign office, and the following year (January 11, 1907) a convention was signed in Berlin which to some extent has solved the problem of the “homeless children”. The Berlin convention provides that Prussia will naturalize all such persons who make application, if “the ordinary legal prerequisites are present”. Naturalization thus remains in the control of the Prussian officials, many of whom have been averse to granting this privilege, their plea being that the possession of the franchise would strengthen the Danes in their fight against Prussian *Kultur*. Nevertheless, several thousand have already been naturalized and the number of the “homeless” has been materially reduced.³¹

III.

The first serious attack on Danish nationalism in South Jutland came in 1871 in the form of an ordinance affecting the teaching of German in the public schools. The matter of the optants, painful as it was, affected only a minority in a direct way; but the ordinance of August 26, 1871, touched the entire population. The substance of this decree was that, beginning with his third year in the public school, every pupil should be given instruction in German six hours each week, and if circumstances demanded it the time might be extended to eight or ten hours. Though the charge that this was done in the interest of *Deutschtum* was strenuously denied, the Danes understood that an attempt to undermine their national strongholds was being made. They protested, but it was to no purpose; more effective was the refusal to buy German text-books. For some time the new subject failed to get its rights, but in the end the officers of the law carried the day, and German began to be taught, though owing to a lack of capable teachers the instruction made little progress for some time.³²

³¹ The most important study of the entire question of the optants is a work by Henning Matzen, *Die Nordschleswigsche Optantenfrage* (Copenhagen, 1904). This has been incorporated in French translation in de Jessen's *Manuel Historique*, pp. 187-295; on the subject of the “homeless children” see pp. 288 ff. Cf. Mackeprang, pp. 260 ff.

³² For a review of conditions in South Jutland in 1887 by H. P. Hanssen-Nørremølle see *Tilskueren*, IV. 485.

A second step in the same direction was taken in 1876, when it was decreed that the German language alone was to have official standing in the administration and in the law courts. Before this time both Danish and German had been employed in public business as circumstances might direct. By the new regulation Danish was outlawed, though it might be used in the lower circle of local institutions for twenty years longer, wherever it would otherwise be impossible to carry on the government. The new law was rigorously enforced and proved an effective weapon in the war against the Danish language.³³

Another step forward was taken four years later when by an ordinance of March 9, 1878, the number of hours of instruction in German in the last year of the public school course was increased to twelve. This ordinance also provided that all instruction in history, geography, singing, and mental arithmetic should be given in German. It will be observed that here was a deliberate effort to give the German view of the world and of history to the youthful mind, and also that the habit of singing German songs was to be carefully nursed. The ordinance further provided that gymnastics should be taught in German as an addition to the twelve hours. The reason given for all this was that the law of 1876 made it necessary to train up a group of men who should be able to transact public business in the official language.³⁴

For a decade after 1878 public school instruction in North Sleswick was given in the proportion of fourteen hours in German to eighteen hours in Danish. There were, however, various ways in which the school authorities were able to increase the amount of actual instruction in German. The subject of religion was taught in Danish; but the law required that in this connection German hymns should be learned and recited. Moreover, the character of the official history was such as to serve the purposes of German propaganda rather than of instruction. Conversation in and about the school was to be carried on in German; the older children were often punished for conversing in Danish.³⁵ Wherever there seemed to be a fair demand for complete Germanization of a school, the authorities acted with remarkable promptness and often on very inadequate information as to the actual desires of the communities concerned.

During the same years the government gradually eliminated all

³³ Mackeprang, pp. 96-97; *Tilskueren*, I. 827-828 (1884).

³⁴ *Tilskueren*, IV. 485-486 (1887).

³⁵ *Nineteenth Century*, LIV. 55. The author, W. Hartmann, investigated conditions in North Sleswick in 1903.

private schools. Whenever opportunity offered, such establishments were closed, and the last private Danish school, a girls' school in Haderslev, passed out of existence in 1888. The justification offered in these cases was that these institutions were not likely to educate the young in a patriotic spirit. At the same time instruction in the homes was practically forbidden, as was the practice of sending the children to school in Denmark. There was therefore nothing to do but to send them to the Germanized public schools, at least until the course was completed and the children were confirmed.³⁶

The final step in the Germanization of the school system was taken in 1888, when by an ordinance dated December 18 all Danish instruction was abolished except in religion, which might be taught in the Danish language where that seemed necessary. The ordinance also allowed the teacher some discretion in the enforcement of the new rules during the first year or two of the pupil's life in school, as the knowledge of German in parts of South Jutland was very slight.³⁷

The law met with immediate opposition. It was felt that to teach religion in Danish would serve no purpose unless some attention were given to the language itself. The Danes, therefore, demanded a minimum of two hours' instruction in their own language as a foundation for the work in religion. In this demand they received some, though rather feeble, support from the clergy. It was urged by the pietistic element in the state church that religious instruction in a language that the children did not really understand was of doubtful value and might even place their souls in jeopardy. Zealous apostles of Germanization though they were, the priests were unable to refute this argument, though their subsequent activities in behalf of the two hours of Danish were half-hearted at best.

The administration was now carried on in the German language. The business of the courts was transacted in German, though frequently with the aid of interpreters. The public school was also German, at least on the secular side. The only public institution not wholly Germanized was the church. It must not be understood, however, that the church had been wholly neglected. Services in the German language had gradually been introduced into churches where Danish only had been preached before; first a few services a year or one service a month for the edification of some German official, who in many cases failed to appreciate the concern shown by the ecclesiastical authorities for his spiritual welfare. But every

³⁶ *Tilskuerven*, IV. 485 (1887).

³⁷ Mackeprang, pp. 176-177; *Nineteenth Century*, LIV. 55.

year there would be a greater number of services in a language that the congregation did not understand. The attitude of the Prussian clergy consequently weakened popular interest in the state church while at the same time it led to a vigorous promotion of the "free church movement" which at one time threatened the regular ecclesiastical establishment in certain localities with total extinction.

The free church was not a new institution in South Jutland, but its period of real growth dates from about 1894. The clerical authorities opposed the movement with all their strength and those who left the established church suffered much petty persecution. No ceremonies were to be allowed at the funerals of free church members; the ringing of bells was forbidden, no hymns might be sung, no prayers said at the grave. Free church services are classed as political meetings and can be held only in the presence of a policeman.³⁸ At the same time the clergy appreciated the power of public sentiment, and there came a conviction that forcible Germanization of the church must cease.³⁹

In 1908 the use of the Danish language was more narrowly limited by a new law governing public meetings, which forbids the use of any language but German in public addresses except for election purposes and except in communities where at least sixty per cent. of the population use a non-German idiom; in such localities this language may be used for twenty years, or to 1928.⁴⁰

The enemies of the ancient civilization of South Jutland soon found a new field for their activities; the process of Germanization would advance more rapidly if the Danes could be deprived of their right to the soil. Persistent efforts have been made to this end during the past decade, though these are not to be charged to the government, but to certain unions and corporations which, it is true, enjoyed the support of the central administration.

In 1898 the Prussian government began to purchase estates in North Sleswick, which were again sold to German colonists on a plan of payments resembling somewhat that employed by the British government under the Irish land purchase acts. But, as there was to be limited ownership only, the plan never became very popular; only thirty-seven such properties were established during the decade 1890-1900 and ninety-three during the following seven years.⁴¹

A society had been organized in 1891 to plant colonies in the

³⁸ Mackeprang, pp. 198-199; *Tilskueren*, IV. 495 (1887).

³⁹ *Tilskueren*, XIX. 516 (1902); see also *ibid.*, IV. 483.

⁴⁰ Mackeprang, p. 272.

⁴¹ Vilhelm La. Cour, "Ejendomsspørgsmaalet i Nordslesvig", in *Tilskueren*, XXVII. 496 (June, 1910). For earlier efforts to secure the soil, see *ibid.*, IV. 487.

western part of South Jutland, but it was not managed honestly and went into bankruptcy ten years later. More important was the Sleswick-Holstein Colonization Society which was founded in 1909 on the suggestion of the Prussian department of agriculture.⁴² The purpose of this organization was to acquire farm land, preferably near the northern border, which the society hoped to colonize with German farmers and laborers. But the project has met with only slight success, as the South Jutes are not easily induced to part with hereditary lands.⁴³

IV.

It has been a very unequal fight, this conflict between the millions of Prussia and the 150,000 Danes in South Jutland; but, on the whole, though they have lost some territory to the Germans, the Danes have maintained their positions with remarkable success. It is only when one examines the methods employed by the Prussian officials and especially by the Prussian police, that one really appreciates what a struggle it has been.

During the years of transition to Prussian control a few irritating regulations were promulgated and enforced, such as a rule forbidding the display of Danish colors; but on the whole there was little real persecution in North Sleswick before 1874, when von Bitter was *Oberpräsident* of the province of Sleswick-Holstein. Von Bitter's activity was directed chiefly against three objects: the Danish-language press, the Danish societies, and the Danish subjects residing in Sleswick, optants as well as immigrants.

It is a well-known fact that Prussian legislation does not allow the press much freedom in any language; it was therefore comparatively easy to make life burdensome for the Danish publications. In June, 1874, the editor of *Freja*, who was a Danish subject, was banished because he was serving as editor of "a paper hostile to the state". When a little later this paper was consolidated with *Dannevirke*, the editorial secretary of the combined publications was promptly excluded from the kingdom. In August of the same year an investigation was set in motion to determine the allegiance of the compositors in the Danish newspaper offices; and all those who were found to hold Danish citizenship were ordered to leave Prussia.

The following year (1875) H. R. Hjort-Lorenzen, the editor of *Dannevirke*, was imprisoned for *lèse majesté*, and while he was still serving his sentence, his successor was found guilty of violating certain newspaper laws and was sent to prison. In 1876 four Danish

⁴² Die Schleswig-Holsteinische Gemeinnützliche Siedlungs-Genossenschaft.

⁴³ On this subject see *Tilskueren*, XXVII. 492-503 (June, 1910).

editors (all Prussian subjects) were serving prison sentences. But von Bitter's persecution bore fruits; the press was cowed, and for a time the editors shunned political subjects.

A decade later, during the administration of Oberpräsident von Steinmann, the persecution broke out anew. In 1884 the editors of *Dannevirke* and the *Flensburg Avis* were fined for libelling a school board; and when they proceeded to publish the minutes of the trial they were again punished, this time with prison sentences. In 1886 two editors went to prison for libelling Bismarck, an offense only slightly less criminal than *lèse majesté*. One of these was the aggressive Danish leader J. Jessen, who later served in the Reichstag. Jessen edited the *Flensburg Avis*, and during a period of less than five years he spent eighteen months in Prussian prisons. An opportunity to begin a suit against a Danish paper for libel was rarely missed; in 1894 the paper *Hejmdal* had fourteen such suits to fight.⁴⁴

Next to the Danish-language press the most dangerous element in North Sleswick from the view point of the Oberpräsident, was the complex of societies which had been established everywhere in the northern part of his province. The principal charge against these was that they had been organized to promote "political agitation". The Danes denied that this was a fact; they were organized to protect and preserve Danish nationalism, the peculiar characteristics of the people which the Prussian authorities had pledged themselves to respect. But the Germans held that any speech or song in praise of Denmark was an "anti-German demonstration".

Among the first to feel the iron hand were the agricultural societies, of which there seem to have been several. These usually gave an annual cattle fair at which there were certain festivities, such as a common meal with songs and speeches. The authorities very often descended upon these, and the fairs sometimes ended in collisions with the police. Various other societies, such as choral unions and workingmen's guilds, were also watched, investigated, and often suppressed.

Twenty years later the attack was renewed, the lecture unions being the principal object at this time. It was charged that the lecturers frequently touched on political subjects, and the term political proved to be a most elastic one. Inasmuch as women were forbidden by Prussian law to be present at political meetings, it was necessary to suppress these societies. In 1898 the promoters of Prussianism secured a court decision which held that all Danish societies were

⁴⁴ On the subject of the persecution of the Danish-language press see Mackeprang, pp. 88-89, 91-94, 169-170, 221, from which these illustrations are drawn.

political from the fact that they had a pro-Danish membership only and did not appeal to German sympathizers. It was, therefore, the duty of the police to suppress them. The situation was made somewhat more tolerable by the legislation of 1908 which allows women to hold membership in political societies; but during the preceding decade, Danish societies found it almost impossible to exist.

Efforts were often made to weaken these organizations by means of frequent litigation. For one thing, the law required that all societies must report promptly all changes in their memberships, withdrawals as well as accessions. Some energetic lawyer discovered that the Danes were not prompt in reporting changes that were caused by the death of members; and as death meant a withdrawal, the societies were violating the law. Several hundred suits were started in 1900 against societies that had not reported losses to their membership by death; the Language Union had about one hundred and fifty suits brought against it and was threatened with destruction. Fortunately, however, the higher courts failed to uphold the contentions of the police authorities and the suits failed.

Another effective method was to deprive the societies of the use of public halls and other gathering-places. When the Danes proceeded to build their own halls, they were often prevented on one pretext or another from taking possession. In one case a police official discovered a crack in the ceiling and condemned the building.⁴⁵

Even more odious, if possible, has been the treatment meted out to unoffending residents, whose only crime was that they were subjects of the Danish king. Many of those who suffered under the tyranny of the successive chief presidents were optants, but among them were also immigrants from Denmark who had been attracted to Sleswick by the advantages of higher wages and a more active labor market. In Article XIX. of the treaty of Vienna it is provided that all who were in possession of "the rights of native born" (*le droit d'indigénat*) both in the kingdom and in the duchies on the day of the exchange of ratifications (November 16, 1864) should remain in possession of these rights. This provision has been variously interpreted, but it was introduced into the treaty on the motion of the Danish commissioners and their intentions are easily determined. In Danish law the native born enjoyed certain rights that were not shared by alien immigrants; a native born, for example, could not be banished from the land, while an alien might be excluded without much formality. It was believed that the sec-

⁴⁵ On the persecution of the Danish societies see Mackeprang, pp. 236-238, 273.

tion referred to would render the inhabitants of South Jutland secure in the enjoyment of ordinary civil rights, whether they were Prussian citizens or not; but the Prussians have repudiated the provision by legal interpretation, and have persisted in treating the optants and other Danish citizens as alien immigrants.⁴⁶

It has already been stated that several editors and compositors were ordered to leave the land in 1874; in the same year the principal of a high school was banished and his institution promptly closed; another Danish subject was banished for having "forced his way into a polling place", though no such offense was observed at the time. In all, twelve Danish subjects were ordered to leave Prussia in that year.⁴⁷

Furthermore, great care was being taken to prevent optants from returning to their homes. Two cõtters who had served in the Danish army in 1864 were promptly banished on declaring their option for Denmark. When the war with France broke out they were in Funen, and one night they stole across the Little Belt to visit their families. The police soon discovered them and they were pressed into service in the Prussian army. A year later their status was again investigated, and they were found to be Danish citizens.⁴⁸

A legal basis for these exclusions was conveniently found in an old ordinance from Danish times (November 5, 1841) which forbade aliens to take up residence in the duchies without permission from the local authorities. The original purpose of this rule had been to control the migration of paupers; but the Prussian police found it useful for other purposes. The ordinance also provided that no clergyman might perform marriage services for such aliens without license from the local administration. This ordinance now came into large use. Danish citizens were ordered to register with the authorities and receive permission to continue in the country. The permits were often issued for one year only and could be recalled at any time. License to marry was often refused, and unauthorized marriages were sometimes punished with banishment.⁴⁹

In 1883 and 1884 there were many cases of banishment. In the latter year a number of South Jutes made excursions to Jutland and other parts of Denmark, and on their return the exclusions began. In some cases men were sent into exile because their wives had taken part in these excursions. From August to November, 1884, about fifty persons were driven from the land, and as some of them

⁴⁶ On the subject of Article XIX. see de Jessen, *Manuel Historique*, pp. 191 ff.

⁴⁷ Mackeprang, p. 90.

⁴⁸ *Tilskueren*, IV. 475-476 (1887).

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, IV. 473.

had families the number actually involved was at least twice as large.⁵⁰

Among the men banished were two brothers whose offense appears to have been that they had little Danish flags on display in their living-rooms. They were men of property, but were given only a fortnight to arrange their affairs and leave the country. It was in their cases that the chief president von Steinmann made a remark which has been widely quoted: "I know very well that you are personally honest and upright men for whom I have great respect . . . but we cannot go on whittling with a pen-knife, we must strike with an ax; and I am very sorry indeed for those who suffer the blow".⁵¹

Prussianism reaped its richest harvest in the later nineties, during the so-called "Köller period". More than three hundred persons were banished in 1898 and approximately the same number in each of the following two years. After 1900 the number declined somewhat; there were about fifty cases of banishment in 1903 and eighteen in 1904. But during the six years of terror (1898-1903) nearly a thousand persons were driven from the province.⁵² Among those who were banished were men with family responsibilities; nevertheless, twenty-four hours was usually the time given in which to arrange for departure. Earlier there had at least been a pretense of trying to fasten some sort of guilt on the person banished, though the charges were often far-fetched; usually it was simply stated that the person in question had become "troublesome" (*lästig*). But in 1891 a number of Danish butter-makers had been banished because their methods were not "economical", and in 1898 a prominent merchant in Haderslev was exiled because he had ceased patronizing a German barber. Von Köller frankly admitted that his victims were entirely innocent; but in banishing the servant he was able to strike at the "fanatical employer".⁵³

At the same time the Prussian police guarded the border carefully lest "agitators" should steal in. In 1875 a company of Danish tourists were refused admission at several ports. No Danish traveling salesman is allowed to operate in North Sleswick, though German salesmen enjoy complete freedom in Denmark.⁵⁴

But the most famous case of this sort was that of a theatrical troupe which came from Copenhagen to Haderslev to entertain the populace with light comedy. There were seven in all, five actors and

⁵⁰ Mackeprang, p. 166; *Tilskueren*, I. 828, II. 227, IV. 472-473.

⁵¹ *Tilskueren*, IV. 473; Mackeprang, p. 166.

⁵² The statistics are from Mackeprang, pp. 227, 235, 258.

⁵³ Mackeprang, pp. 217-218, 227-228.

⁵⁴ *Tilskueren*, XXVIII. 191 (September, 1911).

two actresses. Scenting the danger, the Haderslev police were on hand when the ship touched the wharf, and the entertainers were sent back to Copenhagen. This was in 1894. A German who was present and appreciated the humor of the situation commented on it in the following suggestive lines:

"Lieb' Vaterland, kannst ruhig sein,
Der Feind ist fort, die Luft ist rein."

The same caution is employed in the case of visiting Norwegians. A Norwegian naval officer who came to South Jutland to lecture on a perfectly harmless topic was forbidden to speak and ordered to leave the country. And when Captain Roald Amundsen came to Flensburg some years ago he was permitted to deliver his lecture only after the Kaiser had intervened in his behalf.⁵⁵

Prussian citizens who show an unworthy interest in things Danish cannot be deported, but their offenses can be dealt with in other ways, especially by invoking the law against "disorderly conduct". In Sleswick disorderly conduct (*grober Unfug*) is especially associated with the display of Danish colors (red and white) and the singing of Danish songs. It is the height of disorderly conduct to have a weather-vane with a cross cut out of it, to make building wreaths of white shavings and red ribbons,⁵⁶ to decorate graves with red and white flowers, or to dress in red and white, as all these things indicate affection for the Danish flag. It is told that the police once compelled a man to repaint a red kennel because it was occupied by a white dog.⁵⁷

The singing of such Danish songs as may in any sense be classed as patriotic is also disorderly conduct. In dealing with this offense the police finds its authority in an order issued by the provisional government in 1865 forbidding the singing of "inflammatory" songs. The theory is that, while the songs do not by any means irritate the Germans, they do stir up the emotions of the Danes who sing or hear them. At one time a police official appeared at a cattle fair with a list of songs that were not to be sung. On another occasion a Prussian court secured the services of an expert adviser who produced a list of about sixty songs that were of an inflammatory character and another list of seventy-five which were dangerous. A few young girls in Aabenraa were once so indiscreet as to sing

⁵⁵ *Tilskueren*, XXXIII. 206 (1916).

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, I. 828 (1884.) [The article was written before the end of the war. We retain the present tense. It is not yet known what changes, if any, have come about. Ed.]

⁵⁷ *Nineteenth Century*, LIV. 59 (July, 1903).

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.—17.

a variety of Danish songs; the military forces were called out and the young women were properly fined for disorderly conduct. In one case a woman who sang a Swedish song at a social gathering was seized in the very act by the police and hustled across the border.

It is not always the offender himself who is punished for disorderly conduct of this sort. In 1901 thirteen Danes were deported because Danish songs had been sung at a wedding in Köbenhoved, though at least twelve of the thirteen had not been among the guests on this particular occasion. The principle that communities should suffer for the offenses of the individual was expressed more than twenty years ago by Landrath Mauve of Haderslev circle: "The populace must learn that each is responsible for all. If one member offends, they must all be punished, until through mutual discipline they have taught each other how to keep the peace."⁵⁸

It is only fair to state that a strong minority of the intellectual leaders in Germany have always opposed the forcible Germanization of South Jutland. If we can believe Professor Delbrück, the ordinance that finally outlawed the Danish language originated in the Prussian department of education and met considerable opposition in government circles generally.⁵⁹ Professor Delbrück on various occasions has protested vigorously against the methods employed by the police in the Danish districts; especially did he sound a warning during the Köller period.⁶⁰ It is also true that the zeal of the local administration has often outrun the purposes of the central government. At the same time the local police has usually been able to count on the unqualified support both of the courts and of the higher councils in Potsdam and Berlin.

After the fall of Bismarck (1890) a more liberal policy was adopted, but four years later the new chancellor, von Caprivi, was driven from the helm and the old methods were revived and intensified. It was believed that the convention of January, 1907, would assure more humane treatment for the Sleswick Danes, not because the administration was becoming more liberal, but because the foreign office wished to retain the good-will of Denmark. For a year or two conditions were more tolerable in South Jutland, but since 1909 the old system has again prevailed. In August, 1914, a large number of prominent Danes, the leaders in the fight against oppression, were rounded up and sent to prison.⁶¹ There were no charges against these men, no suspicion that they might be disloyal; but Prussianism is thorough and prepares for all eventualities.

⁵⁸ Mackeprang, pp. 93, 221, 229-230.

⁵⁹ *Preussische Jahrbücher*, CXLI. 562-570 (March, 1911).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, XCV. 179 ff.; cf. pp. 376 ff.

⁶¹ *American-Scandinavian Review*, VI. 286 (September-October, 1918).

V.

In 1884, "after twenty years of alien rule", P. Lauridsen, a young Danish educator, made a survey of conditions in South Jutland and published a report that was depressing and encouraging at the same time. Intellectually North Sleswick was an island, shut off from Prussia by antipathy and national differences, and shut off from Denmark by the iron barriers of Prussian law. On this island the agencies of Prussianism were always at work seeking to undermine the national culture, to erase memories, and to wrench the population from its Danish past. Lauridsen found that in South Sleswick the Danish vernacular had practically disappeared; that in Mid Sleswick it had been almost suppressed; and that to some extent it had also been displaced in the larger cities in North Sleswick. Danish had been driven out of the courts and the administration; the schools were half Germanized; and the German language was also forcing its way into the church.

But Lauridsen also reported that German had after all made but slight progress. More than half of Sleswick was still Danish, and more than half of the population still spoke the Danish idiom. Without the aid of Prussian officials and soldiers what *Deutschtum* there was could not be maintained.⁶²

Since then the process of Germanization has been steadily pushed, at times with ruthless vigor. During these thirty years and more, Danish nationalism has suffered irreparable losses; still, the greater part of the stronghold remains intact. Prussian candidates have at times polled relatively large votes in the elections, but these indicate a change in sentiment to a small degree only. A large number of optants still remain disfranchised, and in some localities the Danes who have the ballot find it expedient not to vote. On the other hand, Prussia has sent a host of officials and other public servants into the land, who never neglect to appear on election day. In addition there has been some actual immigration from the south, especially into the cities, of which Flensburg provides the best illustration.⁶³ Important, too, is the disintegrating force of socialism, which has at least professed an indifference to nationalism, German as well as Danish.⁶⁴

Before 1884 the Danes had made but slight attempts at organized

⁶² *Tilskueren*, I. 825-845.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, IV. 487.

⁶⁴ For maps showing the linguistic and political frontiers in North Sleswick, see Dominian, *The Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe*, pp. 96, 97; de Jessen, pp. 122, 346; Mackeprang, pp. 36, 172. For a map showing the situation in 1884 see *Tilskueren* I. 835.

resistance to Prussianism. But during the eighties they finally agreed to shelve the old policy of protest and determined upon a new course of action. They decided to accept their place in the Prussian state, to discourage emigration, to keep the young men at home, and to organize in defense of their national and spiritual rights.

The situation was all but hopeless. Cut off as they were from their Danish brethren, they could get no reinforcements from across the border. Nor could they get much assistance from their spiritual guides, for the clergy were on the whole pro-German in their sympathies, as one might expect in a body carefully selected by Prussian officials. So the Danes were thrown back on their own resources and forced to look for strength and leadership in their own fellowship.

The story of the opposition to Germanization centres about three important societies, the Language Union, the Voters' Union, and the School Union, which were organized respectively in 1880, 1888, and 1892. Each of these has its own peculiar task and purpose; but after some years of independent action they developed a plan of co-operation and have thus been able to pursue their objects with more unified forces.

The Language Union grew out of the opposition to the ordinance of 1878 which, it will be recalled, gave the German language practically one-half of the time of instruction in the public schools. The idea originated with J. P. Junggreen, a prominent citizen of Aabenraa, but the real founder was Gustav Johannsen, a Danish editor in the German city of Flensburg, who combined great abilities with an attractive personality and unusual tact, and who, for a number of years after the death of Hans Krüger, led the Danes in the battle with Prussianism. The purpose of the Union was to promote the use and study of the Danish language. To accomplish this it has established libraries, assisted lecture societies, distributed historical literature, published a popular song-book, and has otherwise sought to provide for the more obvious intellectual needs of the masses.⁶⁵

The Voters' Union was organized in 1888 on the suggestion of H. P. Hanssen-Nörremölle, who for a long time was its secretary and most active member. (Since the death of Gustav Johannsen, Hanssen-Nörremölle has been the recognized political chief of the Danish party.) The Voters' Union serves as the central organization for political purposes in South Jutland and seeks to secure united action in the various elections; it is the accepted guardian of the civil and political rights of the Sleswick Danes.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ H. P. Hanssen-Nörremölle in *Tilskueren*, IV. 494-495.

⁶⁶ Mackeprang, pp. 147-148.

The School Union came into existence in 1892 by way of reaction against the ordinance of 1888 which eliminated Danish from the public schools. Its purposes are to stand guard over what still remains, the four hours of religious instruction in Danish; to provide teachers for those who wish to supplement the work in the public schools with instruction in Danish at home; and to assist those who desire to pursue a course of study in some higher school in Denmark. In the course of time the emphasis has come to be placed on the third point, and the result has been a steady growth in the number of young people enrolled in secondary schools across the border.⁶⁷

In 1902 these three societies began to hold their annual meetings at the same time and place, and this custom, which has since been followed, has proved a source of strength and inspiration. In a certain sense the "annual meeting" may be said to constitute an unofficial parliament for South Jutland. The co-operating unions also maintain a reserve fund called the "iron fund", which is used to promote the work of either organization wherever and however it shall seem most necessary.⁶⁸

The Danes have also organized a variety of local societies, all of which help to keep alive the fires of Danish nationalism. Of somewhat more than local interest is the Credit Association, which was organized in 1909 to meet the danger of German colonization. It was believed that if the farmers could secure loans on reasonable terms, there would be less temptation to put farm land on the market. The association has done much to achieve its purpose and has also been successful as a financial venture.⁶⁹

The history of South Jutland during the past two generations is a commentary on a series of broken pledges. The promise that the Duke of Augustenborg made on his "princely word and honor" in 1852, renouncing all claim on the sovereignty of the duchies, was broken in the interest of German nationalism in 1863. The treaty of London, which guaranteed the integrity of the Danish monarchy (not the kingdom of Denmark) and in which Prussia and Austria joined, was thrown overboard by those same powers in the London conference in 1864.⁷⁰ It was promised in the treaty of Vienna that the inhabitants of Sleswick should enjoy the "rights of native born"; but this was annulled as soon as the problem of the optants presented itself. The pledge of the treaty of Prague, that

⁶⁷ De Jessen, pp. 388-390; Mackeprang, pp. 201-202.

⁶⁸ Mackeprang, pp. 256-257.

⁶⁹ *Tilskueren*, XXVII. 492-503 (June, 1910).

⁷⁰ Friis, *D. G. Monrads Deltagelse i Begivenhederne 1864*, pp. 78 ff.

North Sleswick should be allowed to determine its allegiance by a referendum, was perhaps never seriously considered after the victories of 1870 and was definitely repudiated in 1878. The Aabenraa convention, which excused from Prussian military service certain groups of young men whose citizenship was Danish, was set aside in 1883. Of all these pledges the one of greatest consequence is the promise of a referendum; and from this promise Prussia has never been released by the party most interested and concerned, the people of North Sleswick.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

DOCUMENTS

Captain Nathaniel Pryor

THE history of the expedition of Captains Lewis and Clark to the Pacific coast of Oregon in 1804-1806 is the object of an interest which, in the country west of the Mississippi, has greatly increased in recent years.

One reason for this growing interest is that the people of the states which now occupy the land which Lewis and Clark traversed with so much difficulty and danger now look upon them as the beginners of the state history.

And the monumental work of Dr. Thwaites in making accessible the "Original Journals" of the chiefs and such of the subordinates as could be found unprinted has furnished a source-book which can be used with unquestioning trust.

The fame of the captains has been long established; of late years the figures of their men have begun to emerge from the mists of the years and to take shape as the heroes that they were. Some of them have never been entirely lost sight of; others seem to have completely disappeared from public view on that September day when they disembarked upon the levee at Saint Louis at the end of their famous journey. The people of the East were little concerned, and the people of the West were too much occupied in subduing the wilderness about them to realize what these men had done. Now, however, many students are engaged in searching for information about them, and the publication from time to time of facts discovered is gratefully welcomed. It is hoped that the story of each man's life will, in time, be clearly set forth. In the absence of knowledge they will like the adventurers of former days become the subjects of myths, or be "enthroned amid the echoing minstrelsy sung of old times".

Indeed, the myth-making process has already begun. Nathaniel Pryor, a Virginia-Kentuckian and a typical American pioneer, is in the way to be transformed into a personality in every way foreign to the man that he was. It appears from Bancroft's *History of California* (vol. III., p. 163), that among the company that arrived in California, under the leadership of the Patties, in March, 1828, was a man whose name is given as Nathaniel Pryor or Nathaniel Miguel Pryor. It is said of him that he was then twenty-three years

old, and that he had lived for four years in New Mexico. This man was a silversmith and clock-maker, and became known as Miguel el Platero. He married a Mexican woman, raised a family, and died in 1850.

Pattie, in his *Personal Narrative*, makes no mention of Pryor, but in the edition of the book edited by Dr. Thwaites and included in his series of *Early Western Travels*, there is an editorial note in which it is assumed that the Pryor mentioned by Bancroft was the companion of Lewis and Clark.

The rule of law that identity of name indicates identity of person is well enough as cautiously applied by courts, subject to disproof by an adversary party, but it is by no means a safe rule for an historian.

Dr. Thwaites's assumption, in spite of its intrinsic improbability, has been followed by others and bids fair, unless its erroneous character is made to appear, to be generally accepted. Happily, however, for the cause of truth, the incorrectness of the assumption is demonstrable.

Miss Stella M. Drumm, the librarian of the Missouri Historical Society, whose knowledge of western history is extensive and accurate, has found in the Indian Office at Washington a series of documents which tell the story of Pryor's later life in unmistakable fashion. Certain of these documents are herewith submitted.

WALTER B. DOUGLAS.

I. LICENSE TO TRADE WITH THE OSAGE NATION.¹

To all, to whom these presents shall come, know ye that I have this day Granted permission to Nathaniel Pryor, to trade with the Osage Nation of Indians, as well as to ascend the river Arkansas with one trading boat to the six bull or Verdigrée together with all the hands, that may appertain thereto.

Given under my hand and private seal (there being no public one) at the Post of Arkansas this 29th day of November 1819—Of the independence the forty fourth.

(signed) ROBT. CRITTENDEN
Sect. and a. G. A. T.²

¹ Nos. I., II., III., IV., and VI. are enclosures in a letter of Agent Vashon to Lewis Cass, secretary of war, April 30, 1832, a letter written "for the purpose of exhibiting the true character of the question respectfully referred for the consideration and decision of the Department". In the files of the Indian Office all these are contained in a folder marked "1832 Cherokee West Agency—Geo. Vashon—Claim of N. Pryor".

² Meaning, "secretary and acting governor of Arkansas Territory". Robert Crittenden of Kentucky was secretary of the territory from 1819 to 1829.

A true copy from the original on file in this office

GEO. VASHON³

Agt. Chers. west.

West'n Cherokee Nation

Agents Office April 30th, 1832

II. AFFIDAVIT OF PRYOR.

U. S. of America

Arkansas Territory,

Crawford County

This day personally appeared before me, John Nicks, one of the Justices of the Peace in and for said County, Nathaniel Pryor of the Osage Nation of Indians, who being of lawful age and duly sworn according to law, deposed and said that some time in the month of February 1820, on the Virdigris River, a branch of the Arkansas or Paune River, at said Pryor's trading house,^{3a} about one and a half miles above the mouth of said Virdigris, this deponent had about one hundred and fifty weight of Beaver fur, and about said time a Cherokee Indian by the name of Dutch and two others, companions of his, took from the possession of this deponent the said one hundred and fifty weight of Beaver fur the property of this deponent and which said Beaver fur has never been restored to him or any part thereof, nor the value or any part thereof.

This deponent further stated that about the month of February, 1822, the Cherokee Indians stole from his possession a large bright bay horse, with a star in his forehead, and about fifteen hands high and which said horse he has never been able to recover or reclaim nor the value thereof, or any part thereof, and further this deponent said not.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this 11th

day of September 1824

NATHL. PRYOR

JNO. NICKS

J. Peace

I certify the above to be a true copy from file in this office.

GEO. VASHON,

Agt. Chers. West.

West'n Cherokee Nation,

Agents Office April 30th, 1832

III. AFFIDAVIT OF DAVID McKEE.

United States of America

Arkansas Territory

Crawford County

This day personally appeared before me John Nicks one of the Justices of the Peace in and for said County, David McKee of said

³ Capt. George Vashon, formerly of the Seventh Infantry, agent to the Cherokees west of the Mississippi.

^{3a} Pryor is mentioned as living among the Osages, on the Verdigris in 1821, by James, *Three Years among the Indians and Mexicans* (St. Louis, 1916), p. 108, and the *Missionary Herald*, XIX. 74. In that year he accompanied Glenn and Fowler in their expedition to the mountains; Coues, *Journal of Jacob Fowler*, p. 4, etc. See also note 22, below.

County who being of lawful age and duly sworn according to law deposith and saith that in the month of February 1820 a Cherokee Indian by the name of Dutch, with two other Cherokee Indians came to Nath. Pryor's trading house on the Virdigris River, a branch of the Arkansas River, and at that time the said Nathaniel Pryor had in deposit at said place about one hundred and fifty weight of furs, well secured under lock, and that on the evening of the morning on which said Indians left the trading house, he, the said deponent discovered that the lock which secured the fur, had been forced, and the sa[i]d one hundred and fifty weight of fur were stolen, and as this deponent verily believes by the said Cherokee Indians.

The deponent further states that fur was selling at that time at two dollars and a half per pound and further this deponent saith not.

DAVID X McKEE

Sworn and subscribed to before me this
11th day of September 1824

JNO NICKS
Justice Peace

I certify the above to be a true copy from file in this office.

GEO. VASHON
Agt. Chers. West

West'n Cherokee Nation
Agents Office April 30th, 1832

IV. STATEMENT OF E. W. DUVAL.⁴

The taking of the property is not denied by the Individual charged with it, but he alleges as the cause and justification of the act, or acts, that he met at Mr. Priors Trading house, at the time mentioned, a War party of Osages, under the Chief called Mad Buffaloe, that at that time the Osage and Cherokee Nations were at open War with each other, that he the Dutch (the Individual referred to) commanded and then had with him a War party of Cherokees, that his party was more numerous than that of the Mad Buffaloe and that the latter were completely in his power, that he considered them as his prisoners and was waiting only until they should leave the premises of Mr. Prior to capture and secure them. That during this time he was invited out on one side of Mr. Priors House as he believes at the instance of Mr. Prior by a man named McKee or McGee, where he and his party were detained by amusements until the Mad Buffaloe and his party had time to escape; that he believed and still believes, their escape was contrived by Mr. Prior; that on discovering they (the Osages) were gone he immediately pursued but could not overtake them; that for this interference, as he considered it, on the part of Mr. Prior, whereby he was prevented making prisoners of the party and in so far weakening or injuring the enemy and rendering essential service to his own nation, he took the property for which Mr. Prior claims payment.

Mr. Prior having admitted to the agent the material facts set forth by the Dutch as to the aid and assistance he gave to the Osages to

⁴ Not dated, but presumably of the same date as the two affidavits preceding. Major duVal (so he was wont to sign his name) was for some years, from 1822, agent to the western Cherokees.

make their escape, The Committee desire that the case may be su[b]mitted to the consideration of the Secretary of War, for his decision. They would refer it to him on these grounds. That the Osages and Cherokees were relatively to each other independent Nations with whom the U. S. were on terms of amity and friendship. That Mr. Prior, a citizen of U. States intermarried with an Osage Woman, carrying on trade and intercourse with that nation and was as it would seem to the committee bound to have preserved a perfect neutrality between the belligerent parties; and that by having aided the Osages in the manner set forth by the Dutch and admitted by himself he ceased to maintain the character of a neutral and thereby subjected his property to seizure by the party injured.

I certify that Mr. Prior admitted to me that he did interfere in the manner stated to secure the escape of the Osages from the Cherokees.

Signed E. W. DUVAL

A true copy from the original on file in this office

GEO. VASHON
Agt. Chers. West

West'n Cherokee Nation
Agents Office April 30th, 1832

V. FRANKLIN WHARTON TO SECRETARY JAMES BARBOUR.⁵

CRAWFORD COURT HOUSE, A. TERR.
Feby. 28th, 1826

Secy. of War:

Sir;

Capt. N. Pryor of this Territory has requested me to use means towards obtaining a liquidation of a just claim, which he supposes he has against the U. S. Will you allow me to represent its nature and solicit your answer to certain inquiries.

Capt. Pryor was the first person who volunteered his services in Lewis and Clark's expedition. He accompanied them through all their excursions and was finally sent in command of the party, to take back the Mandan chief and family to their homes. Of the event of this, you are aware. From that time to the period, when he derives his claim, he was engaged in extensive and dangerous business among the Indian Tribes.

About eighteen months before the late war, he was licensed by the Gov. of Missouri, as a trader among the Weenibagoes or Puans, on the Eastern Mississippi, Ter. of Missouri, at a place called DeBuque's Mines.⁶ At that place he was transacting a profitable business had buildings erected as well as a smelting furnace, and was rapidly distributing through the Tribes the comforts and conveniences of civilization. About six months before the War, he received a letter from Gov. Clarke, requesting him to endeavour to find out Tecumseh or the Prophet. The execution of this duty, a duty performed at the wish of

⁵ In a folder marked "1826, Arkansas—Franklin Wharton—Claim of N. Pryor for Depredations". Franklin Wharton (1804—1847) was a son of Lieut.-Col. Franklin Wharton (1767—1818), U. S. M. C., and a younger brother of Col. Clifton Wharton, U. S. A. Dardanelle, which he gives as his address, is on the south bank of the Arkansas, about half-way up from Little Rock to Fort Smith.

⁶ Now Dubuque, Iowa.

the Government—a duty delicate and hazardous in the extreme, rendered Capt. P. an object of hostility and enmity with the natives, From receiving the letter of the Gov. the Captain had heard nothing of a war likely to ensue. He was actively and industriously engaged in his occupation. On Christmas day and even after of the year '12 the Winbagoes were trading peaceably with him. On the 1st of Jany. 13 about 12 O'clock in the day, eight of the tribe came to his house, with their war accoutrements, and offered violence. They would not let him leave his dwelling. About sun-down of same day, sixty arrived, shooting down the oxen in the yard and killing two of his men. They rushed on him, and was in the act of putting him to death, when by the politic dissimulation of a female in the house, they were averted for the moment from their intention. They then placed him in the house with a sentinel over him, intending to burn him in it. While they were plundering his stores and ravaging his premises, with the greatest difficulty, he made his escape. After crossing the Mississippi on the cakes of ice, he was still the object of pursuit to the hostile Indians. They were not so soon to forget his endeavours for Tecumseh. They robbed him of all they [he] had in the world: they entirely destroyed every article of his property. Capt. P. only claims the original amount of his goods, amounting to 5,216\$ 25 cents. He asks not the freight on them: he asks not what they were actually worth to him—he asks nothing for his buildings, his furnaces, his cattle, save two, which were shot down before his face. He, in fact, asks for less than what he conceives to be his just claim. And his reason is; for that which he seeks a remuneration he can positively swear to the amount. He will not add more, as he cannot remember certainly the value.

Capt. Pryor is a man of real, solid, innate worth. His genuine modesty conceals the peculiar traits of his character. He was a brave and persevering officer in the attack on New Orleans. He has the most thorough knowledge of the Western country; has been on considerable service to the U. S., and the benefit he has conferred on the Indian Tribes is gratefully acknowledged by them. He has been frequently urged by Gov. Clarke the Supt. of Ind. Aff. and by Gen. Miller, the late Gov. of this Territory⁷ to forward this claim. But he has refused. His own exertions have hitherto been his support. Again robbed and plundered by the savages, viz Cherokees he is left in a situation, where the money would be of service to him. His want drives him to that, which hitherto his conscious pride prevented. You will observe, that it was six months after the declaration of war, this transaction occurred. Yet had the traders no knowledge of it. The British Indian allies, received it first through their emissaries. It was not known at St. Louis 'til months after it took place. And does not Capt. P's claim derive additional support, from the fact that Gov. Clark was bound to give notice of the war, and at the time, such notice had not been given. The Capt. was trading under the license and protection of the U. S.; by an act of the U. S. of which he was ignorant, he was deprived of his property and his home. You will also please to remember that, the tribe was allied with the English troops. I am not aware, Sir, that this

⁷ James Miller (1776–1851), the hero of Lundy's Lane, governor of Arkansas Territory 1819–1825, collector of the port of Salem (under whom Hawthorne served) 1825–1849.

claim falls under your cognizance, of this much, I am certain, that, if you cannot *officially* interest yourself in it, its details will ensure your warm and generous support. The eloquent advocate of the abstract rights of man, will not lend a cold and feeble support, to what has connection, with the more kind and gentle feelings of humanity. If not inconsistent with your duty, would you be pleased to answer these enquiries.

Does this demand come within the scope of those, which have hitherto been termed just and equitable by the U. S.? If it bear no analogy to former claims allowed, is it your opinion, that it is a fair one against the U. S.? What measures are necessary to place it before the proper authority, and what is that authority?

During the spring Gen. Clark has promised to have the necessary depositions taken. . . .

A letter will reach me, directed to "Dardanelle", Crawford Co. A. T. I have the honour to be

Yr. obt. Servt.

FRANKLIN WHARTON

To James Barbour Esq'r
Sec. of War
City of Washington,
D. C.

VI. PRYOR TO MAJOR DUVAL.

FORT SMITH, Augt. 21, 1826.

Maj'r Duval

Sir.

Please pay Saml. Rutherford^s Two hundred dollars out of the Claim that you have of mine against the Cherokees and this shall be your receipt, etc.

I am with great Respect, yours, etc.

(signed) NATHL. PRYOR.

The Original endorsed viz.

Order of N. Prior in favor of Sam'l Rutherford \$200.00 Left with me by Mr. Rutherford until a claim of Mr. Priors shall Have been decided on by the W. Department: if the claim be admitted Mr. R. wishes me to retain the amt. of this order out of it for him.

E. W. D.

Nov: 20, 1826

A true copy from the original on file in this office

GEO. VASHON

Agt. Cher's West.

West'n Cherokee Nation

Agents Office April 30th, 1832

^s Samuel M. Rutherford was for many years clerk for Pryor and Richards at Arkansas Post, and while in their employ in 1819 was appointed sheriff for Clark County, Arkansas. From 1823 to 1825 he was county clerk of Phillips County; from 1825 to 1830, sheriff of Pulaski County. In 1832, when the U. S. Land Office was opened in Hempstead County, he was appointed register. He also served as territorial treasurer from 1833 to 1836. Hempstead, *Pictorial History of Arkansas* (St. Louis, 1890); and Shinn, *Pioneers and Makers of Arkansas* (Little Rock, 1908).

VII. MAJ. WILLIAM MCCLELLAN TO GEN. WILLIAM CLARK.⁹

LITTLE ROCK, (A. T.) May 28, 1827

*General William Clark**Superintendent of Indian Affairs**Sir*

I am happy to hear from Capt. Pryor that he is willing to serve, if appointed Sub-Agent to the Osage Indians; no man can render the same services to the United States than Capt. Pryor can with those Indians. He can speak their language, and they have every confidence in his counsel and advice. . . .

Respectfully

Your Obdt. Servant

WM. MCCLELLAN

C. A. W. M.¹⁰VIII. LIEUT. J. F. HAMTRAMCK¹¹ TO CLARK.

ST. LOUIS, June 18, 1827

Sir:

. . . Capt. Pryor possesses every necessary qualification and would accept the office. I therefore have the honor respectfully to suggest the propriety of such a measure and ask your attention to it.

very respectfully

your obt. Servt

J. F. HAMTRAMCK,

U. S. Ind'n Agt. for Osages.

To Gen'l Wm. Clark

Supt. of Ind'n Affairs

IX. CLARK TO BARBOUR.

SUPERINTENDENCY OF IND'N AFFAIRS.

ST. LOUIS, Aug. 4th, 1827

Sir.

Since the death of the Sub Agent of the Arkansas Band of Osages, no appointment has been made to fill the vacancy. As the situation of that Band requires a Sub Agent of respectability and influence, I have employed Capt'n Nathaniel Pryor, at the rate of \$500 pr ann. and given

⁹ Nos. VII., VIII., and IX. are in a folder marked "1827, Osages (sub-agency)—Wm. Clark—Appointment of N. Pryor sub-agent". Governor George Izard of Arkansas Territory writes to the Secretary of War on June 6, 1827, from Little Rock: "On my way from New Orleans I became acquainted with Capt. Nath. Prior, a very intelligent man, who accompanied Mess. Lewis and Clark to the Pacific Ocean, and has since that time been much among the Indians, particularly the Osages. I learned from him that he was directed by Gen. Clark the Superintendent at St. Louis to speak to me relative to the advantage of having a sub-agent appointed to reside with the band of Osages who are designated as Clermo's, and to ask my co-operation in recommending the measure to the Government. . . . I am induced by these motives to join Gen. Clark in proposing the appointment of Capt. Prior to the sub-agency in question." *Publications of the Arkansas Historical Association*, I. 445.

¹⁰ Choctaw agent west of the Mississippi.

¹¹ John Francis Hamtramck the younger (1798-1858), who had resigned from the army as second lieutenant, and later was a colonel in the Mexican War.

him a temporary appointment of Sub Agent. His influence among the Indians generally, in that quarter, his capacity to act and be serviceable, added to his knowledge of the Osage language, would it is believed justify his receiving the appointment and pay of Sub Agent and Interpreter, which would enable him to perform those duties which Col. Arbuckle,¹² and the Choctaw and Osage Agents have suggested in their letters which I have the honor to enclose. Capt. Pryor served with me, on an expedition to the Pacific ocean in 1803, 4, 5, and 6 in the capacity of 1st Sergeant; after which he served as an officer in the Army, and was disbanded after the last war.¹³ When out of Service, he has pursued the Indian trade, in which he has been unfortunate, first by the Winnebagoes, who took every article he had and for which he has a claim before Congress, and since by casual occurrences in his commercial pursuit on the Arkansas.

Capt. Pryor's long and faithful services and his being disabled by a dislocation of his shoulder when in the execution of his duty under my command, produces an interest in his favor and much solicitude for bettering his situation by an office which he is every way capable of filling with credit to himself and usefulness to his government.

I have the honor to be

With high respect

Your most obt. servt.

The Hon.

James Barbour,
Secy. of War.

WM. CLARK

X. SAM HOUSTON TO SECRETARY EATON.¹⁴

*Gen'l Jno. H. Eaton*¹⁶

Sir,

WIGWAM NEOSHO¹⁵

15th Dec. 1830

I have the honor to address you on the subject of Capt. N. Pryor's claims to the appointment of Sub Agent to the Osage nation of Indians, which I had the pleasure of mentioning to you, when I was last in the City. You then took down his name, as an applicant, and assured me, tho you "would give no pledge, yet his claims should be considered of". Mr. Carr, who has recently deceased was appointed, and Capt. Pryor passed by. His claims I have taken leave to state to the President, and do most earnestly hope that they may be met by the well deserved patronage of the Government.

¹² Mathew Arbuckle, colonel of the Seventh Infantry.

¹³ Nathaniel Pryor of Kentucky, ensign First Infantry, February 27, 1807; second lieutenant, May 3, 1808; resigned April 1, 1810; first lieutenant Forty-fourth Infantry, August 30, 1813; captain October 1, 1814; honorably discharged June 15, 1815.

¹⁴ Nos. X., XI., and XII. are in a folder marked "1830, Osages (sub-agency) —Col. Arbuckle, Sam Houston—Asks appointment for N. Pryor".

¹⁵ Houston went to the Cherokee country in 1829. In 1830 he established himself on the west bank of the Neosho, a short distance above its junction with the Arkansas, and nearly opposite Fort Gibson. Here, in a wigwam, and later in a log cabin, he lived until December, 1832.

¹⁶ Secretary of War.

It is impossible for me ever to wish, or solicit, any patronage from the Government for myself, or any one connected with me, but when I see a *brave, honest, honorable and faithful servant of that country, which I once claimed as my own, in poverty with spirit half broken by neglect, I must be permitted to ask something in his behalf!*

Could any just man know him as I do, who had *power* to offer reparation for what he has done for his country, what he has suffered, I am sure he would not be allowed to languish in circumstances hardly comfortable.

I trust in God, that he will be no longer neglected, by his country.

With high respect,

I am your mo ob sert

SAM HOUSTON.

XI. HOUSTON TO PRESIDENT JACKSON.

WIGWAM NEOSHO,

15 Dec. 1830

To Genl. Jackson:

Sir,

I have the honor to address you upon the subject of one of your old soldiers at the "Battle of Orleans." I allude to Capt. Nathaniel Pryor, who has for several years past resided with the Osages as a sub agent, by appointment of Gov. Clark but without any permanent appointment from the Government. A vacancy has lately occurred by the decease of Mr. Carr, sub agent for the Osages; and I do most *earnestly* solicit the appointment for him. When you were elected President of the U. States, I assured you that I would not annoy you with recommendations in favor of persons who might wish to obtain office, or patronage from you. But as I regard the claims of Capt. Pryor as peculiar and paramount to those of any man within my knowledge, I can not withhold a just tribute of regard.

He was the first man who volunteered to accompany Lewis and Clark on their tour to the Pacific Ocean. He was then in the Army some four or five years, resigned, and at the commencement of the last war entered the Army again, and was a Captain in the 44th Regt., under you, at New Orleans; and a *braver* man never fought under the wings of your Eagles. He has done more to tame and pacificate the dispositions of the Osages to the whites, and surrounding Tribes of Indians than all other men, and has done more in promoting the authority of the U. States and compelling the Osages to comply with demands from Colonel Arbuckle than any person could have supposed.

Capt. Pryor is a man of amiable character and disposition—of fine sense strict honor—perfectly temperate, in his habits—and unremitting in his attention to business.

The Secretary of War assured me when I was last at Washington, that his "claim should be considered of", yet another was appointed, and he was passed by. He is poor, having been twice robbed by Indians of Furs and merchandise, some ten years since. For better information, in relation to Capt. Pryor, I will beg leave to refer you to Gen. Campbell, Col. Benton, and Gov. Floyd of Va, who is his first cousin.¹⁷

¹⁷ Pryor's mother was a sister of Col. John Floyd (d. 1783) and of Capt. Charles Floyd. The first Governor Floyd of Virginia was a son of the former,

With every wish for your Glory and Happiness, I have the honor to be your most obt servt

SAM HOUSTON.

[Endorsed:] Refer[r]ed to the Secretary of War

A. J.

XII. COL. MATHEW ARBUCKLE TO EATON.

HEAD QRS 7TH INF'TRY

CANTONMENT GIBSON¹⁸

19th Dec'r, 1830.

To the Honbl. John H. Eaton,
Secretary of War.

Sir,

Capt. Nathaniel Pryor, who has been acting as sub-agent to the Osage Nation of Indians for several years, was not a little disappointed, and mortified, when Mr. L. Choteau was appointed the agent to that Tribe,¹⁹ in not receiving from the Government the appointment of sub-agent. That office is again vacant, and he is anxious of receiving it.

In relation to the pretensions of Capt. Pryor, I believe I am justified in saying that he had done more than all the agents employed in the Indian Department in restoring peace between the Indians on this Frontier particularly in restraining Clermont's Band of the Osages²⁰ from depredating on the neighboring Tribes, as well as on our citizens, which they had been in the Habit of doing for a number of years. Much of this service was rendered by Captain Pryor before he was authorized to act as sub-agent to that Band, and since he has been acting by authority, except in one or two cases, soon after his appointment, the conduct of the Osages under his particular charge has been as good as that of any Indians in this country. Yet if he was now removed from that Band I would not be surprised if they should commence their former Habits, and thereby disturb the peace of this Frontier.

The high standing of Capt Pryor for Honesty and Worth together with the service he has rendered to the public, and the call (as I judge) there is for his continuance, I hope will insure to him the appointment he desires.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

With Highest Respect

Yr Obt Servt

M. ARBUCKLE,

Colo. 7th Inf'try

Sergeant Charles Floyd, of the Lewis and Clark expedition, of the latter. N. J. Floyd, *Biographical Genealogies of Virginia-Kentucky Floyd Families* (Baltimore, 1912), p. 16.

¹⁸ Now Fort Gibson, Oklahoma.

¹⁹ Paul Liguette Chouteau (1792-1851), son of Jean Pierre Chouteau of St. Louis, and younger brother of Auguste, Pierre Chouteau who was a companion of Pryor on the voyage up the Missouri on the occasion of the unsuccessful attempt to return the Mandan chief to his home in 1807.

²⁰ For Clermont, principal chief among the Osages, see Long, *Expedition*, II. 237-248, and J. B. Wilkinson in Coues's *Pike*, pp. 557-558.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.--18.

XIII. PAUL L. CHOUTEAU TO PRYOR.²¹

OSAGE AGENCY, 4 Apr. 1831.

To Capt. N. Pryor,
U. S. Sub Agt.

Sir.

This will be handed you by Major D. D. McNair, Sub Agent for the Osages, who visits your post by my directions in order to obtain information relative to the present State of existing difficulties between Clermonts Band of Osages and the Cherokees, and to make the necessary arrangements for contemplated meeting of those tribes at Cantonment Gibson on the 1st and 5th May next. . . .

Your Obt. Servt.

Sign'd P. L. CHOUTEAU
U. S. Ind'n Agt for Osages

XIV. PRYOR TO CHOUTEAU.

CANT. GIBSON, 6th Feb'y 1831

Dr. Sir

I have been confined by sickness at this post for five or six weeks and am not yet sufficiently recovered to return home, until the weather moderates, which is uncommonly cold. . . .

I am Sir respectfully

N PRYOR

Maj'r P L Chouteau
U. S. Agent for Osages

Sub Agt for Osages

XV. PRYOR TO CHOUTEAU.

UNION MISSION,²² Feb'y 19, 1831.

To P. L. Chouteau
U. S. Agt for Osages

Dear Sir

When I last wrote you I expected to return home before this time. . . . This has been prevented by the continuance of my bad health. I am now some what recovered, hope soon to be restored to good health. I am sorry for the delay in sending the accompanying letters to you. . . .

Yours with respect

Sign'd N PRYOR

U. S. Sub Agent for Osages

XVI.

[In a tabular statement of "Superintendents, Agents, Sub Agents, and Interpreters" (contained in a folder so marked), we find mention of

²¹ Nos. XIII., XIV., and XV. are in a folder marked "1831, Osage Agency—Wm. Clark, P. L. Chouteau—Osage and Creek Hostilities".

²² Union Mission was established in 1821 by the United Foreign Mission Society as its first station among the Osages. It was located on the Neosho River about twenty-five miles above its junction with the Arkansas. Carey and Lea, *Historical Atlas* (1822), note, map no. 35. Captain Pryor accompanied in 1820 the missionary who, going in advance to explore, selected this site. [Sarah Tuttle], *Letters on the Chickasaw and Osage Missions* (Boston, 1831), pp. 37, 45.

Nathaniel Pryor, appointed May 7, 1831, stationed at Cantonment Gibson, as sub-agent for the Osages of the Verdigris, and attached to the Osage agency under Chouteau; pay \$500.]

XVII.

[On May 10, 1831, Captain Pryor, as witness, signed a treaty between the Creeks and all bands of the Osage Nation, at Cantonment Gibson.]

XVIII. CHOUTEAU TO CLARK.²³

ST. LOUIS, 30th June, 1831.

Sir.

A few days since I informed you of the melancholy death of Mr. D. D. McNair,²⁴ late Sub Agent for the Osage Nation. Since which I have been informed of the death of Captain N. Pryor, another Sub Agent for the Osages, which leaves the Nation without a Sub Agent, and as the business of the agency requires a Sub Agent to be appointed as soon as possible, and it being my wish that Captain Thomas Anthony should receive the appointment, having heretofore recommended him to your notice, and that of the Government of the United States. . . .

I have the honor to remain

Most Respectfully
Yr obt st.

P. L. CHOUTEAU,
U. S. Ind. Agt. for Osages.

To Genl. Wm. Clark,
Supt. Ind'n Affs.
St. Louis, Mo.

²³ This document is in a folder marked "1831, Osages (sub-agency)—Wm. Clark, P. L. Chouteau—Conditions".

²⁴ D. D. McNair "was killed by lightning, June 2, 1831, while riding across the prairie in the night, not far from his post". *Missouri Republican* (St. Louis), June 28, 1831.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Processes of History. By FREDERICK J. TEGGART, Associate Professor of History in the University of California. (New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1918. Pp. vii, 162. \$1.25.)

ACCORDING to Professor Teggart, the problem which should properly concern historians, at least in so far as they wish to be classed with scientific scholars, is the question of "*how man everywhere has come to be as he is*". Many historians would at once exclaim that this is precisely what they have been doing—explaining how man has come to be as he is. But no, Professor Teggart would answer, what you have been doing is to relate, mainly in narrative form, selected particular events in the history of certain groups of people—Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Chinese. This tells us what men have been and what they have done, but not how they have come to be as they are; it tells us the facts but not the processes of history. What we need to know are those events that are common to all peoples rather than those that are peculiar to certain peoples. Only by approaching the past in this way, by a comparative study of the history of all peoples, primitive as well as civilized, can we arrive at conclusions that will have a scientific validity.

This is, of course, an old question, and one that cannot be discussed in a brief page or two. Personally, I have no quarrel with this method of approaching the study of history. The life of man may be studied in many ways—the more the better; and I have read with pleasure and profit the compact and well-written little volume in which Professor Teggart, surveying mankind from China to Peru, draws from his observations (with the aid, it must be said, of a good deal of *a priori* reasoning) certain conclusions, comprehensive and general enough certainly, the validity of which it would doubtless be hazardous to deny—as, for example, that among primitive people migration is due to the reduction of the food supply, that the direction of migration is conditioned by the geographical factors, that "political" organization arises as the result of the conflict of groups for the possession of distinct territories, that the influence of group ideas and traditions tends towards fixity and stagnation, that the conflict of two groups with different group ideas and traditions tends towards change and modification, and so on. All this is suggestive; and, although one feels that with a different selection of facts it would be possible perhaps to reach different conclusions, the method, if persistently applied, is one which would doubtless lead to an

explanation of "how man everywhere has come to be as he is"—that is to say, it would explain the *universal processes* of historical change.

If, however, Professor Teggart maintains (as I am not sure that he does), that this is the only proper way to study history, then I do not agree with him. I do not think that it is even the most profitable way to study history, although I am quite ready to admit that it may be the only "scientific" way. We need to know more about man than the universal processes of his conduct, although we do not need to know more than that about the conduct of beetles, and the reason for that is that we are men and not beetles. Not being ourselves beetles, we cannot enter into the conduct of beetles with a sufficient degree of sympathetic understanding to make it worth while to chronicle the biography even of distinguished beetles, or of such groups of beetles as may have attained a high degree of advancement; but being men we can understand the conduct of men, not only through the abstract generalization of those impersonal forces that condition their conduct, but also through a knowledge of the concrete events of their lives and a sympathetic appreciation of the conscious motives and purposes that determined their action. In the *Phaedo*, Socrates is made to speak of the man who might try to

show that I sit here because my body is made up of bones and muscles . . . and as the bones are lifted at the joints by the contraction or relaxation of the muscles, I am able to bend my limbs, and this is why I am sitting here in a curved posture; that is what he would say, and he . . . would assign ten thousand causes of the same sort, forgetting to mention the true cause, which is that the Athenians have thought fit to condemn me, and accordingly I have thought it better and more right to remain here and undergo my sentence.

Here are two radically different explanations of the conduct of Socrates—of how he came to be sitting in his cell. They are entirely incommensurable explanations, in no sort of conflict with each other, each being entirely adequate in its own field but altogether useless in the other: the one explanation has to do with those material forces which enable men everywhere to sit in a curved posture; the other has to do with the human motives which induced Socrates to remain in his cell. Might we not say that the one explanation is scientific and the other historical?

At all events, without quarrelling over the terms "historical" and "scientific", if Professor Teggart thinks we cannot fully understand how man everywhere (as, for example, in Europe at the present moment) has come to be as he is without determining the universal processes of history, I bid him God-speed in the search for those processes. But as for myself, I find the state of man as it now is in Europe intelligible, in so far as it can be made intelligible, chiefly through a study of the concrete doings and sayings of particular Europeans, more especially during the last hundred years or so; and in the endeavor to attain this kind of understanding, the sort of information which I find most useful is that

which reveals the conscious motives and purposes that appear to have had a determinative influence.

CARL BECKER.

The History of Statistics, their Development and Progress in Many Countries. Collected and edited by JOHN KOREN. (New York: Macmillan Company, for the American Statistical Association. 1918. Pp. xii, 773. \$7.50.)

THIS is a memorial volume issued to celebrate the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the American Statistical Association. It opens, therefore, as might be expected, with a history of the association. This very brief narrative by John Koren is largely devoted to telling something of the men who have been prominent in the association and the conspicuous services rendered by each. In general outline, the chief activities of the association are also recorded. In the next chapter, Dr. S. N. D. North discusses the progress of statistics during the last seventy-five years and the outlook for the future. This very broad subject is necessarily covered in a most general way.

The remainder of the volume consists of a series of histories, for various leading countries of the world, of the advancement of each in knowledge of a statistical nature concerning itself. A prominent statistician of each nation, who is or has been closely identified with the statistical work thereof, describes the statistical progress in his own particular country from its earliest recorded beginnings down to the present time.

The extension to different fields of the collection of numerical data is usually traced in considerable detail. The studies are confined to the expansion of statistical information and deal to no noticeable degree with the development of or instruction in statistical method or theory. Although private statistical studies, especially those of early days, are treated to some extent, the great bulk of the space is devoted to the kinds of data collected by various governmental units.

While differing markedly in elaborateness and form, the histories are all written in scholarly and readable style. The history of federal statistics in the United States by Dr. John Cummings is especially to be commended because it gives an apparently well-balanced, critical appraisal of the value of leading types of statistical studies made by our government. In the opinion of the reviewer, the work of many of the other writers might have been made even more valuable to the readers had the authors followed a similar course.

In reading the various histories, one is impressed by the fact that extensiveness of statistical knowledge is largely coincident with progress in civilization and governmental efficiency. In Russia, the elaborateness of the plans made contrasted with the meagreness of the results actually obtained, also the extreme decentralization and incomparability of the

tistics actually gathered, seem to throw some light upon present social and governmental weaknesses in that vast region. While there is much improvement yet to be sought, the United States seems to stand out in favorable contrast to most of the other large nations, both as to the scope covered and as to the systematic way in which statistical work is carried on. Some of the small nations of northwestern Europe seem also to have made most commendable progress in the organization of their statistical studies.

The various authors were asked to suggest improvements which might well be made by their governments in the collection of statistical material. Dr. A. Kauffman of Petrograd believes in allowing to the local governmental units free rein with practically no control from the national government, voicing thus clearly his distrust of anything emanating from the Tsar's authority. Practically all of the other writers, on the contrary, urge an increase in centralization of power or control. Some point out the danger, however, that if all statistical work is placed directly under one central bureau, the special investigations by various departments may not be made in a form to meet the exact needs of those departments or may even be discontinued altogether. Several countries seem to have partially solved this dilemma by establishing a central commission of scientists which attempts the co-ordination of all studies undertaken without actually being in charge of the work.

Many of the authors comment upon the extreme difficulty of obtaining well-trained statisticians since most universities provide courses adapted merely to the training of statistical clerks rather than of statisticians.

Most of the histories are extremely valuable because of the bibliography of the statistics of the respective countries which they contain. The book is without parallel in its contents, is well edited and printed, and is a distinct credit to its authors and to the American Statistical Association.

WILLFORD I. KING.

Social and Private Life at Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence.

By GEORGIA WILLIAMS LEFFINGWELL, Ph.D. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. LXXXI., number 1, whole number 188.] (New York: Columbia University. 1918. Pp. 140. \$1.25.)

THE present study clearly sprang from the desire to use more extensively than has hitherto been customary the comedies of Plautus and Terence for a delineation of contemporaneous Roman society. The range of topics treated is broad even if not quite complete. The collection of material, for which the specialist should be grateful, is extensive, although unfortunately not exhaustive. The presentation is clear and gives evidence of unusual independence of judgment. Finally, the author does well to call attention to a very difficult problem about which,

as she pertinently observes, a great deal of confusion prevails. But with Dr. Leffingwell's main contention, namely, that Plautus and Terence depict in general the customs and usages prevalent at Rome in their day, I must express my complete disagreement. The narrow limits set for this review preclude a discussion of the question here, but Dr. Leffingwell's attempt to establish her contention by the citation of numerous parallels from authors who were professedly describing Roman life, is in my opinion a failure. The sound critical attitude towards this question has been admirably expressed by the eminent scholar M. Dareste apropos of a somewhat similar effort to use Plautus as a source for Roman law: "Ce qu'il faut prouver, c'est que la chose était inconnue au droit grec, et qu'elle ne peut s'appliquer que par le droit romain. En appliquant cette règle de critique rigoureuse, on sera peut-être forcé d'abandonner quelques illusions, mais ce sera autant gagné pour la science."

Aside from the error in principle just mentioned there are also some serious faults which render this study at times an untrustworthy guide for the layman. The judicious will grieve over the tendency to base sweeping generalizations upon very slight evidence. Hasty workmanship no doubt accounts for such blemishes as the failure on pp. 14 f. to note the source of a rather long passage from a recent article, although most of it is a *verbatim* quotation. Some of the texts cited are not correctly interpreted, and there is insufficient familiarity displayed at times with the special literature upon the topics discussed, as well as with the general tools and methods of philological criticism. This is the more to be deplored because the author might have enjoyed at Columbia University the counsels of some of this country's foremost specialists in the field of Roman comedy. Hermann Usener's classic *Rektorsrede—Philologie und Geschichtswissenschaft*—should be the *vade mecum* of every student of classical antiquity, and especially in the following lucid formulation of principle:

Wenn es also wahr ist, dass der Boden aller geschichtlichen Wissenschaft das geschriebene Wort ist, so folgt dass die Kunst, welche dasselbe feststellt und deutet mittelst ihres grammatischen Vermögens, die letzte Voraussetzung aller geschichtlichen Forschung ist. Diese Kunst haben wir in der Philologie erkannt. Philologie ist also eine Methode der Geschichtswissenschaft, und zwar die grundlegende, maassgebende. Denn nur sie besitzt in ihrer Kenntniss der sprachlichen Form die letzte Gewährleistung für das richtige Verständnis des Überlieferten (pp. 29 f.).

In full justice to the author it should be observed, however, that an adequate treatment of the subject to which she has addressed herself upon advice, requires a degree of erudition in both Greek and Roman antiquities and a mastery of philological and archaeological technique which might well have tasked the powers of a Hugo Blümner himself.

W. A. OLDFATHER.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Imperial England. By CECIL FAIRFIELD LAVELL and CHARLES EDWARD PAYNE, Professors of History in Grinnell College. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1918. Pp. ix, 395. \$2.00.)

To fix the Great War correctly in a setting of British imperial history, to show where it belongs in the development of the empire, is not an easy thing to do. It can hardly be hoped that a single book will fully accomplish the task, and it is high praise to say that Professors Lavell and Payne have obtained an unexpected success.

The great feature of the book is the skill with which a rapid sketch of long periods of history has been managed. An outline of British imperial history in 350 pages, of the foundation, to Elizabeth, in fifteen, of the rise of sea-power in seventeen, of eighteenth-century colonial expansion and the American Revolution in twenty-eight, and so on, seems absurdly impossible. And yet there can be no doubt but that the average reader will have a far clearer and more lasting view of the really essential facts in the growth of the empire of to-day from this book than from a half-dozen volumes of more formal history. The result has been reached of course by a rigid exclusion of detail. "To tell all this [certain summarized details] would be only to repeat what may be learned in any school-book." On the other hand there is a lavish expenditure of space on details that seem very remote—the youth of David Livingstone for instance—but which do in the end reveal the foundations of empire and give concreteness to an outline. An attractive and lively style adds greatly to the general effectiveness.

It is to be said also that the book is far more correct both in general statement and in detail than such outlines are apt to be. La Salle and Leibnitz would hardly have agreed with the estimate of Louis XIV.'s insight into the value of colonies for world power; the Tories of the American Revolution would have given a quite different reason for their loyalty than sympathy with the party of royal prerogative and vested privilege; the colonies did not put so much emphasis on the distinction between external and internal taxation; and Pitt's plan cannot be called a federal union of Great Britain and the colonies. But such things as these are relatively unimportant in the face of the larger and more essential accuracies. The importance of American colonial expansion westward in the eighteenth century for the future is clearly indicated. The American Revolution is put in its true perspective in the development of the whole empire, and the proper correction made of the narrow view of sole economic interest which is so lacking in insight and historical imagination. "To suppose that the American Revolution taught the people of England the lesson of colonial self-government is a mistake that could only spring from our cheerful readiness to manufacture large and impressive generalizations without facts"—an impressive

generalization, it might have been added, exceedingly hard to banish from our minds. The true causes of expansion in India in spite of opposition at home; the meaning of the occupation and settlement of Australia; the transition to responsible government in the colonies; the change in the idea of empire since the middle of the nineteenth century; a quite impartial statement of Boer troubles and Irish discontent, yet with clear indication of their relation to modern progress and civilization; and a vivid account of changes that have rapidly developed under the stress of war—these are some of the outstanding features of great value in the book. It deserves the widest circulation and study.

G. B. ADAMS.

The Constitutional and Parliamentary History of Ireland till the Union. By J. G. SWIFT MACNEILL, M.P. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1917. Pp. xxxi, 516. 10 sh. 6 d.)

PROFESSOR MACNEILL adopted a novel plan in preparing his book on the constitutional and parliamentary history of Ireland up to the time of the Union. Nine out of ten students of the constitutional history of Ireland, confronted with the absorbing task of writing a history of it, would have been inclined to take the years from the repeal of Poynings's Law in 1782 to the Union in 1800, and to have described the constitution and its working during these eighteen years. Admittedly the Parliament of Ireland was at its best in these years. Poynings's Law was of the past; so were the Undertakers; the privy council in Dublin was shorn of the power it long exercised of "cushioning" bills passed by Parliament which were en route to London for allowance or disallowance there; and from 1793 Roman Catholics were freed from their disabilities, and could exercise the parliamentary franchise. The Castle, with all that Dublin Castle has always meant in the inner political life of Ireland, survived. Some of its power went with the repeal of Poynings's law; but it was still an interesting and sometimes, as in the earlier years, a sinister institution. Professor MacNeill did not adopt this plan—a plan with much to commend it. Instead of any such plan he hit on the novel idea of taking Butt's epoch-making speech of 1873 on the Irish Parliament and the constitution of Ireland; and with this masterly presentation of the subject—a presentation that Butt made in a speech apparently not more than an hour and a half in length, at the Home Rule conference of 1873—as his background or starting-point, Professor MacNeill has filled in the details, drawing for this purpose very largely on writings or speeches of all the earlier authorities on the constitutional and parliamentary history of Ireland.

Proceeding in the manner which has been described, Professor MacNeill begins with Mountmorres's *Irish Parliaments*, and works through the whole range of authorities from Mountmorres's permanently serviceable treatise, to Lecky and Froude, with some drafts from writers on

Irish history of even more recent times than these two well-known authorities on Ireland and its political institutions and political life and political leaders. Biography, memoirs, and letters have been similarly brought into service. Unfortunately Professor MacNeill has failed us as regards a bibliography, or a table of sources and authorities. But it is obvious from the text that in the preparation of the volume, few, if any, worth-while sources of Irish history have been overlooked. The plan that Professor MacNeill adopted has its advantages; also its disadvantages. One of the obvious disadvantages is that the plan adopted, despite the extreme care and great skill with which it has been worked out, gives the book the appearance of a compilation—an appearance which is made a little more striking by the author's method of inserting sources and authorities, printed in italics, in the text instead of at the foot of the page.

One of the most valuable contributions to Irish history embodied in the book—Professor MacNeill's address of 1911 on Irish parliamentary life—is in the notes or appendixes. It was an address delivered before the Eighty Club of London, when the members of the club, at the outset of a tour of Ireland, were assembled in a hall in the Bank of Ireland—in a room that until the Union in 1800 had been the chamber of the House of Lords of the Parliament of Ireland. The subject, the occasion, and the place of delivery, were all such as to appeal strongly to a student like Professor MacNeill, whose sympathies are so obviously with Ireland and its nationalism, and who is steeped in Irish history and in the traditions and lore of the Irish Parliament and of the city in which that parliament held its sessions from 1559 to the Union. The result of these auspicious conditions was an address of singular interest and of permanent value. It was an address so marked in character as to make one wish that there was a little more of Professor MacNeill, and a little less of quotation and extract, in the book to which this sketch of Irish Parliamentary Life is appended merely as note C. As it stands, Professor MacNeill's book is in a class by itself; for while within the last fifteen or twenty years there have been three or four additions to the history of the Irish Parliament, it is difficult to recall any work of modern times that is concerned with the constitution of Ireland in the days before the Union.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Economic Development of Modern Europe. By FREDERIC AUSTIN OGG, Associate Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1917. Pp. xvi, 657. \$2.50.)

"It is the purpose of this book to indicate the origins, and to explain with some fullness the nature and effects, of a number of the more important economic changes and achievements in Europe during the past three hundred years" (preface). The volume falls into four parts, of

which part II., Agriculture, Industry, and Trade since 1815 (pp. 117-340), is the most substantial and best lives up to the promise of the preface. At the same time, parts III. and IV., Population and Labor, and Socialism and Social Insurance (pp. 343-641), cover the portion of the field in which the author is best at home and of which he can speak with authority.

Part II. may be said to be complete in itself, as a sketch of the economic history of Europe through the period selected. And as narrative and description covering its period it should be a very serviceable text, facile, engaging, and well-proportioned on the whole. It is also, on the whole, conceived in a dispassionate, historical spirit; safe and sound, in a conservative sense, with no undue color of patriotic animosity or partizan intolerance. What the professed historians may have to say of its adequacy as a presentation of the history of this period, is another matter, of which the reviewer is not competent to speak. But something is due to be said of it as an endeavor "to indicate the origins, and to explain . . . the nature and effects of . . . economic changes and achievements".

It is sane, sound, impartial, and considerate, within the range of commonplace preconceptions that were current among politicians and publicists toward the close of the nineteenth century, and that still continue to guide the policies of conservative statesmen; and it sheds the light of those preconceptions, in a felicitous manner, on the received account of the origins and the nature and effect of economic changes. In any other sense it can scarcely be said to explain or account for any appreciable group or sequence of events or for any detail of the unstable situation which has arisen out of the historical era with which it is occupied. The work of presentation is well done, and there is no reason to question the accuracy of the information which it gives; nor is it necessary to find fault with its natural limitations, although it may not be easy to avoid a feeling of disappointment with an explanation which takes those things for granted that chiefly need to be explained. These preconceptions that have guided the economic statecraft of the European nations through the later period of the era have brought these nations into the unstable situation of the twentieth century and have brought on the climax of their working-out in the Great War; and it might fairly be expected that some effort should have been spent in accounting for their origins, nature, and effects, seeing that they are the major facts in the case; whereas they are tacitly taken for granted as premises inherent in the nature of things.

So, *e.g.*, that progressive growth of chauvinistic nationalism that characterizes the late-Victorian period, and after, is assumed as a matter of course, and its imperialistic politics as it runs throughout the European countries is accepted at the face value assigned it by its disingenuous spokesmen, as a striving after the common good. This was written

late in 1916, when the war brought on by the bankruptcy of these preconceptions had been running for something more than two years. So unreservedly is the author committed to these bankrupt preconceptions of reactionary statecraft, that he even finds himself at home in the "fair-trade" manoeuvres by which the gentlemen-investors of the United Kingdom have been seeking to safeguard their unearned incomes (pp. 270-277). So again, the policies and adventures of governments and politicians in colonial enterprise and trade expansion are taken, quite naïvely, not at their patent value as a conspiracy of gentlemen-concessionnaires and dynastic statesmen, but at their conventionally putative value as an enterprise for the common good—and all in the glaring light thrown on these bankrupt policies by the war which is the only common outcome to which they have visibly contributed. The historical explanation at this point as at most others does not go beyond the most unguarded *post hoc* of statistical census exhibits. In the same sense there is a painstaking and very intelligent narrative of the growing uneasiness of the working classes in these countries, and of the efforts which the workmen have put forth to better their lot in the losing game they have played under the same preconceptions, as well as of the measures taken by the governments to conciliate the workmen and reconcile them to the rules of the losing game; but it is, again, a description of events, not an explanation of their nature and incidence. The statistical upshot of it is exhibited, but there is nowhere even a tentative answer to the Why?—such as one looks for under the caption of explanation; nor is there anything like an analysis designed to cover the other question—What is likely to come of it all?

THORSTEIN VEBLEN.

The Great European Treaties of the Nineteenth Century. Edited by SIR AUGUSTUS OAKES, C.B., lately of the Foreign Office, and R. B. MOWAT, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Corpus Christi College. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1918. Pp. xii, 403. 7 sh. 6 d.)

NOTHING could be more timely than the appearance of this volume. At the moment when the younger Andrassy is dissolving the Austro-German alliance, when Danes are demanding the effective application of Article V. of the treaty of Prague, and when the wrong done to France in 1871 is about to be righted, the authors have furnished in documentary form many of the facts most essential to a comprehension of the coming settlement of Europe. Historians will find the book of the greatest convenience for purposes of reference, and amateur students of international diplomacy (in other words the general reading public) will have at hand a compact *abrégé* of recent diplomatic relations. The book is simple in form, consisting, in addition to the opening chapter on the technical aspects of the conclusion of treaties, of eleven chapters,

each dealing with a phase of diplomatic relations during the nineteenth century: the settlement of 1815, the independence of Greece, the neutrality of Belgium, Turkey and the powers, the question of the Danish duchies, Italian unity, the Austro-German quarrel, the Franco-German quarrel, Turkey, Russia, and the Balkans, the Triple Alliance. Each chapter begins with a brief historical summary of the events leading to the more important treaties pertaining to the subject, the texts of which follow. Thus the two chapters on Turkey and the Balkans contain the text of the treaty of Paris (1856), the Straits Convention, the Declaration of Paris, the treaty of London (1871), the treaty of Berlin, the treaty of London (1913), and the treaty of Bucharest, with the treaty of San Stefano in an appendix.

The authors have chosen their material wisely and certain omissions, such as that of the Gladstone treaties regarding Belgium in 1870, and the Turko-British convention respecting Cyprus, are of no great importance. A chapter on Egypt would have been useful, but this is evidently regarded as beyond the scope of the title, "European". The reviewer's chief criticism is that the historical summaries, although they are admirable in their brevity and in the lucidity with which they carry on the narrative of events leading up to the conclusion of each treaty, do not as a matter of fact explain or analyze the main issues of the several international quarrels dealt with. The text of the treaties requires elucidation, which should emphasize, first, the character of the points in dispute, and, in the second place, the degree of success attained by the settlement. Such explanation is not always contained in the commentary. It is notably lacking in the chapter on the treaties of 1815; the commentary in this chapter is clear in its statements and to one knowing nothing of the history of the period will prove useful, but it is hardly more explanatory in character than the *Annual Register*. It is possible that the authors' interest in diplomacy has led them into the attitude of professional diplomats, who too often have had regard for external facts rather than for the elemental forces lying at the roots of international quarrels.

The few errors in detail which the reviewer noted do not materially affect the value of the chronological table and the index.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

Modern and Contemporary European History. By J. SALWYN SCHAPIRO, Ph.D., Associate Professor of History in the College of the City of New York. Under the Editorship of JAMES T. SHOTWELL, Ph.D., Professor of History in Columbia University. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1918. Pp. xiv, 804. \$3.00.)

IN the prevailing furious flood of historical literature rather belatedly released for the enlightenment of our countrymen regarding the con-

fused affairs of our volcanic neighbor across the Atlantic, Professor Schapiro's book is bound to arrest attention. Fashioned as a volume *ad usum scholarum* it falls into a class inaugurated in 1907 by Robinson and Beard's *Development of Modern Europe*. A review of this rapidly growing group brings out the interesting fact that the swing has been steadily away from stating the development of nineteenth-century Europe in exclusive terms of politics to a view calling for the inclusion of matter borrowed from the related fields of society and economics. With this newest volume the broadening tendency reaches another stage, for Professor Schapiro is prepared to identify history with life itself. In his preface he tells us that his plan is to treat of nothing less than "the evolution of European civilization during the nineteenth century", for which purpose he includes "social, economic, and cultural matters with the military and political". Has he realized this inclusive, this unifying programme? Let it be said with frank admiration that he has brought within the compass of a single volume an enormous material, arranging it in orderly perspective with reference to a single viewpoint; but let it also be frankly declared that, in the light of this experiment, the time is not yet ripe for squaring history with the whole vast field of civilization. When that time comes, history, or at least that division of it which deals with civilization, will be chiefly synthetic and interpretative; it will be a philosophy of a new, pragmatic sort. As a matter of fact a tendency toward synthesis distinguishes Professor Schapiro's text, for behind its marshalled facts appears, vaguely adumbrated, an interpretation of nineteenth-century movements based on a definite view of man's destiny. Only, regrettably, we never get a clear, unmistakable statement on this head, an omission which, negligible in an ordinary political history, is extremely disconcerting in a work dealing with civilization. True, we are left in no doubt that the author considers the key to modern life to be what he calls progress; but progress, always present, is never defined. Like a *deus ex machina* it turns up at every crisis, handsomely solving all difficulties and sending everybody on his way rejoicing. On such occasions progress looms like a new Absolute, scarcely distinguishable from an Hegelian "idea"; but then suddenly and without warning it declines from its exalted state, manifesting itself with a sooty, prosaic grin as just locomotives, coal-output, steam-plows, and automobiles. If progress is to give us the form or forms by which civilization becomes intelligible, the author owed it to his readers to begin by solidly establishing his concept in terms of both philosophy and history.

But if this confident conjuring with an ill-defined formula stirs the sediments of skepticism deposited by time in the heart of the middle-aged reviewer, the young student, to whom the book is primarily addressed, will register no similar reaction. He will, after the manner of his kind, gladly respond to the optimistic message of the author, and he will find

his vision generously enriched by a consistent view of Europe as a single family which, though falling into different national groups, is engaged in working out through combats, blunders, and heart-ache a glorious common destiny. Furthermore, the reader will find a learned, well-balanced presentation of the many forces, political, economic, scientific, and even literary which have combined to make the modern world. Often enough, for instance in the introduction dealing with the French Revolution, events are linked in a causal relation which is subject to challenge. This will always occur when history makes interpretation its chief business, but it is no serious drawback as long as an author maintains, as Professor Schapiro honorably does, a fair-minded outlook studiously and sincerely concerned with giving each fact and influence its due weight. Valuable aids are afforded the student by twenty-seven maps scattered through the text and by a carefully selected bibliography at the end.

FERDINAND SCHEVILL.

Militarism and Statecraft. By MUNROE SMITH, Professor of Jurisprudence in Columbia University. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1918. Pp. xix, 286. \$1.50.)

"It is the purpose of this essay to compare the conduct of Austro-German diplomacy before the outbreak of the World War with that of Prussian and German diplomacy in the Bismarckian period; and, in so far as the more recent diplomacy was less successful than the earlier, to indicate what seems to have been one of the principal obstacles to its success."

In this opening paragraph Professor Munroe Smith not only indicates the purpose of his book, but passes judgment on the interesting question of Bismarck's responsibility for the war. That the great chancellor must bear some part of the blame is undeniable, for the political system which vested the question of peace or war in an irresponsible government was his creation; and there also is no doubt that the insufferable conceit of contemporary Germany was born in the sweeping triumphs of the wars engineered by Bismarck. But the author believes that German diplomacy has incurred the guilt of precipitating the present war precisely because it abandoned Bismarckian practice and precept.

The first two chapters are devoted to an elaboration of this thesis. Bismarck's diplomacy, according to Professor Smith, was governed by two principal axioms: the value of the defensive position, which places the onus of starting a war on your adversary and endows you with "the whole weight of the imponderables"; and the danger of a policy which aims at power or prestige, as opposed to the promotion of national interests. In the three wars by which he achieved the unification of Germany, Bismarck managed to place his opponent technically in the wrong, and the positive advantage in each case was British neutrality.

After 1870, appreciating fully the distrust which his own methods had aroused, the chancellor was careful to steer a safe course which left the position of Germany unassailable and which did not commit her to support an adventurous policy of either Russia or Austria-Hungary, with both of which powers Germany maintained intimate relations. The result was peace in Europe and the ascendancy of Germany in its councils.

As for the method, "the keystone of Bismarck's entire foreign policy, from the beginning to the end of his official career, was the maintenance of friendly relations with Russia" (p. 26). By this means he kept France isolated and restrained the ambitions of Austria-Hungary. Nor did he allow serious difficulties to develop with Great Britain. Professor Smith quotes various utterances of Bismarck after his retirement criticizing the new departure of William II. in the Far East and the changing policy towards Russia and in the Balkans; all of which led to the disaster of 1914.

Proceeding from this hypothesis, that Bismarck's policies were dictated by a correct estimate of the European situation, the author analyzes in detail the diplomacy of the Central Powers in 1914 and finds it universally and completely at fault. In spite of the remark that "the ultimatum sent to the Serbian government was in the main defensible as to its content" (p. 135), he contends that Teutonic policy was striving for power and prestige, not for the defense of vital national interests. "By attacking Serbia, Austria menaced the existing balance of power in the Balkans; and it was on this ground, not on the ground of a duty to protect a Slav state, that Russia intervened" (p. 49). He refuses absolutely to accept the German contention that the Russian mobilization was an adequate *casus belli*—a contention put forward by the military party to justify their taking control of affairs, and a point of view successfully opposed by Bismarck from the beginning to the end of his career. In this connection the fact is noted that the German failure in 1914 to eite the promise of neutrality in the event of defensive war, which Britain had made in 1912, was tantamount to admitting that the Russian mobilization was not a hostile act.

In his third chapter, dealing with the German Theory of Warfare, Professor Smith quotes Clausewitz and Hartmann to show that the state of mind revealed by the German *War Book*, also extensively quoted, dates back several generations, at least among military men. Then, remarking that "never in the history of the world has the militarist theory had a fairer or a more crucial test" (p. 198), he asks, "What has been the result of the experiment?" The answer follows:

Today Germany has enemies in every continent and in the islands of all the seas. German theorists have learned that the world, although politically unorganized, is capable in an emergency of collective action against an offending state, just as the mining camp, although destitute of constituted authority, is capable of collective action against a claim-

jumper. The world is organizing itself into something that looks very like a vigilance committee.

And as this review is being written (October 19, 1918), we seem to hear the rumblings of the storm within Germany which portends the repudiation of the military state by those upon whom it has imposed itself.

The last chapter, on German Land Hunger, sets forth the familiar story of the growth of German ambitions and the specific expression of these ambitions by various Germans since August, 1914. The well-known collection by Grumbach provides much of the material. Once again the author makes a striking comparison with the Bismarckian era.

"Before 1870 there was little of the spirit of militarism in Germany outside of Prussia, nor was the Prussian people as a whole animated by this spirit. Few Germans even dreamed of military conquests or of world empire" (p. 206). But to-day, he deliberately concludes, the nation is "temporarily insane" (p. 266). And we may cherish with him the hope that "Today, as was the case a century ago, when the allied Russians, Germans, and English overthrew Napoleon, the defeat of an empire may be the salvation of a people".

The value of Professor Munroe Smith's book lies in the fact that a biographer and admirer of Bismarck has shown how the Germans have fallen short of his example and teaching. If some of the German pamphleteers who criticized the policy of William II. because it was not sufficiently Bismarckian, *i. e.*, not sufficiently vigorous, had understood more clearly the real policy of their hero, the world might have been spared the miseries of the present war.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

European Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies to 1648. Edited by FRANCES GARDINER DAVENPORT. (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1917. Pp. vi, 387. \$2.50.)

THIS volume is a contribution to the fundamental need of those who undertake to discuss historical questions, namely, trustworthy original material. The concoction of spurious documents for purposes of public deception is an industry of which no age has enjoyed a monopoly; and, after such a document has once found its way into circulation, ignorance, carelessness, and partizanship may be expected to assure it a relative immortality. Occasionally, however, perhaps after the lapse of a long time, there comes a painstaking, conscientious investigator, whose regard for the truth outweighs the desire for notoriety and the impulse to make "copy", and raises the question of evidential value. The results of his work will not be found on popular reading shelves, where

they conceivably might tend to discredit current guides; and popular writers may regard his labors with a contempt not unminged with apprehension. But they will be received with gratitude by sincere and honest students, in whom they inspire a feeling of confidence.

In this select category the present volume is to be included. On every page we see the evidence of painstaking, conscientious research. No trouble has been spared to trace and verify texts; and the result is a collection of materials on whose authenticity the student may rely.

These materials, as the editor's introduction explains, embrace fundamental documents relating to the great struggle which, from the middle of the fifteenth century onwards, took place between the maritime powers of Europe over the division of trade and dominion in the newly discovered lands in the western hemisphere. The first document is the papal bull of January 8, 1455, granting to Portugal exclusive rights as to trade and territory in the region south of Cape Bojador; the last is a collection of extracts from the celebrated treaty between Spain and the Netherlands, concluded at Münster, January 30, 1648—a crucial document to which more than one important international controversy during the past quarter of a century has run back. A few of the documents are now printed for the first time. Of the texts in other languages than English and French, translations, made chiefly by the editor, are given.

In connection with what is said in the editor's notes concerning the effects of the temporary union between Portugal and Spain, from 1580 to 1640, I venture to refer, for a statement of territorial gains in the Brazils in the interior of the continent, which may be set off against certain losses elsewhere by Portugal, to the *Statement* of the late Baron Rio-Branco, as agent of Brazil, in the arbitration by the President of the United States of the Misiones question. (*Statement*, I. 19–20.)

J. B. MOORE.

John Pory's Lost Description of Plymouth Colony in the Earliest Days of the Pilgrim Fathers; together with contemporary Accounts of English Colonization elsewhere in New England and in the Bermudas. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by CHAMPLIN BURRAGE, B.Litt., sometime Librarian of Manchester College, Oxford, and of the John Carter Brown Library, Brown University. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1918. Pp. xxiv, 65. \$5.00.)

OF the three documents here printed only one is of probable value. John Pory, "Secretary for Virginia", a gentleman who did a variety of work for Governor Yeardley, was also speaker for the first House of Burgesses, was a much-travelled man before he reached America, had written several books of some importance, had been confidential agent for the Privy Council. Obviously his impressions of Plymouth

would be important. He came in the summer of 1622 and wrote a sort of report to Lord Southampton of the Virginia Company on his way back to England in the fall and winter of 1622-1623. It is by no means our first information about Plymouth, as Mr. Burrage seems to imply in his preface, for *Mourt's Relation* was written in 1621 and published in London in 1622, but it is the first account by an outsider. Yet despite a good deal of detail about the flora and fauna, of a not too veracious type, there is no new information in the letter. To be sure we learn that the Plymouth folk were a virtuous people, had built a strong stockade and fort, and were at peace with the Indians. Pory also states that they were really hunting for Annisquam on Cape Ann when they found Plymouth Harbor. The reading of the manuscript is beyond question, "Anquam", and is not improbably what was meant by "Anguum" as printed in *Mourt's Relation*, and which has been interpreted Agawam or Ipswich, across the bay from Annisquam. But Bradford says nothing of such a search for Annisquam, and *Mourt's Relation* definitely declares that the suggestion to settle there was negatived before the men set out in the shallop to look for Plymouth. This sole additional information is perhaps not reliable and throws some doubts on the general accuracy either of what Pory remembered or of what they told him. The real interest of the letter lies in his failure to mention at all their separatism, their half-starved and tattered condition, or their failure to receive supplies. Neither the tone nor the text of the letter gives the slightest indication of the real economic, political, and religious conditions at Plymouth as we know them to have been. Bradford's remarks in the brief postscript he prints from Pory seem to show that they convinced him of the importance of his report to the future of their enterprise and induced him to make a report which should be as favorable to them as possible, and therefore to suppress such facts as would either invite interference from the crown or dissuade settlers from coming to them. They were apparently very frank with him, showed him the works of Robinson, argued their consonance with Scripture, and persuaded him to do them the valued service of silence. Pory thus quotes with enthusiasm Bradford's statement "that for the space of one whole yeare of the two wherein they had beene there, dyed not one man, woman, or child", concealing of course effectively the frightful mortality of the first six months. The editing seems less capable than Mr. Burrage's previous minute scholarship. Some of the foot-notes are obvious, and a good deal of critical information might have been supplied, a longer account given of Pory's and Norwood's interesting careers, and the five and one-half pages, out of a total of ten in the introduction, which were devoted to quoting the text printed in the body of the book, would have provided ample space therefor. Mr. Burrage states in his preface that the handwriting of the manuscript was difficult to decipher; it will probably impress most students as a remarkably clear and simple example of an early Stuart secretarial hand.

ROLAND G. USHER.

George Westinghouse, his Life and Achievements. By FRANCIS E. LEUPP. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1918. Pp. xii, 304. \$3.00.)

IN narrative form readily followed by non-technical readers, Mr. Leupp presents a comprehensive survey of the achievements of George Westinghouse in mechanical and electrical arts. He designedly leaves to technical experts the task of preparing "an adequate summary of what the whole world's industrial advancement owes to the work of the eminent inventor", his purpose being to produce a volume whose mission is "simply human".

The presentation of incidents surrounding the birth and development of the more important inventions is interwoven with a fund of pertinent anecdotes centring about Mr. Westinghouse. To provide a picturesque setting for his story the author manifestly has exercised liberally the imagination of the novelist, especially in the introductory chapter. Some of the dialogues appear a bit fanciful; but the general treatment is such as to render the volume a fascinating history of the more notable accomplishments of the great industrialist.

In the public mind, the name Westinghouse is primarily associated with the air-brake, universally employed in the control of railway trains, his first invention of national importance. The biographer makes clear that his contributions to other industries have proved equally vital to human welfare.

The account of his work in connection with railway signalling, gas engines, steam turbines, and the distribution of natural gas illustrates his characteristic alertness in adapting instrumentalities to accomplish desired results. The plan of centralizing the operation of train-brakes was prompted by witnessing the disastrous effects of an accident due to the inefficiency of hand-brakes; but the solution of the perplexing problem of transmitting the requisite power to the brakes attended a perusal of a description of the use of compressed air in drilling the Mt. Ceniz tunnel.

The inventor's interest in the electrical art was stimulated by an account of apparatus devised in Europe for transforming high pressure electric currents into energy of low pressure. Previous experience with the transmission of natural gas over long distances under high pressure and locally reducing the pressure to fit consumption requirements, taught him the utility of adopting a parallel procedure in the distribution of electricity.

Faith in himself, an indomitable will and confidence in his ability to conquer, conspicuous characteristics of Westinghouse, are splendidly evidenced in the recital of his success in overcoming the intense opposition of his chief competitor in the electrical field, to the introduction of the alternating current, and again in the account of the manner in which he met and solved problems encountered during the financial

stresses of 1891 and 1907, which threatened to overwhelm some of his great industries.

In his endeavor to present a satisfying picture of the personality of George Westinghouse, the biographer is greatly hampered by the entire absence of personal letters and other documents of a character tending to reveal his deeper nature. If the portrayal should impress his close associates as inadequate, it nevertheless will be evident that the author has faithfully sought, by interviews with those best qualified to inform him, to acquaint himself with the real personality of Mr. Westinghouse. He has thus been able so to illuminate the account of Mr. Westinghouse's productive work by remembered sayings and episodes as to give to the reader a fairly vivid picture of a man possessed of a native, unassuming dignity which barred familiarity but invited cordiality, whose earnestness in pursuing inventive and creative work inspired others, and who by his genial nature, kindly spirit, and thoughtful consideration won the friendship, admiration, and confidence of all.

Mr. Leupp has performed an unusually difficult task with great credit.

CHARLES A. TERRY.

A History of Missouri. By EUGENE MORROW VIOLETTE, Professor of History in the State Normal School. (Boston, New York, and Chicago: D. C. Heath and Company. 1918. Pp. xxxiii, 500. \$1.60.)

THIS book is primarily intended as a text-book for Missouri high schools. The author despairs of having the history of the state taught in such schools as a separate subject (in which despair we hope that he is not justified), and consequently has prepared this book for use along with the course in the history of the United States, and to this end has emphasized certain selected topics. The result is a well-designed and a well-executed piece of work. At the head of each chapter is a brief note calling attention to that phase of the history of the United States with which the subject of the chapter is most intimately connected, and at the close of each chapter reference is made to the most easily accessible authorities. The topics are well chosen and, in the main, adequately presented. They relate to the settlement of Missouri and to the social, economic, and political life of the people. There are chapters on Slavery, Banking, and Railroads, and on the Indian and Mormon troubles. An interesting chapter on the Downfall of Thomas Hart Benton might, at first, be thought to be a break in the general plan of the book, but when it is remembered that for many years the real political parties in the state were Benton and Anti-Benton, its appropriateness will be manifest. The great part taken by Missourians in the explorations and development of the Western country, which is generally ignored by writers, is here well set forth. There are portions of the history of the state which cannot, even after the lapse of so many years, be fitly pre-

sented within the limits of a text-book. It is doubtful, indeed, if the time has yet come when they can be truly told. The Kansas troubles and the War of 1861-1865 have left fire that still smoulders. Mr. Violette's account of the Kansas troubles is fair, from a Northern standpoint. He fails to state the Missourians' belief that since they had explored and conquered the country of Kansas and the Southwest they had the right to such political power as it might afford in the councils of the government at Washington, and that while opposition to the introduction of slavery was the pretext, the fight, on the part of the North, was really for the attainment of political predominance. The contest which resulted was a real war in little, and the "Border Ruffians" who took part in it were of the quality who offer willing service whenever the country needs their aid. The writer of this notice well remembers a benevolent Presbyterian elder, a man universally respected in his community, who had been a leader of the "Border Ruffians". The chapters on the War of 1861-1865 give a fairly impartial and adequate narrative of the principal events of those years. The story is brought down to the present year, and closes with a prophecy that an amendment to the state constitution prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors would be adopted at the fall election. The historian should not assume to be a prophet. The unwisdom of assuming such a rôle was demonstrated by the fall election mentioned. The book is one to be commended to both the teacher and the general reader. The former will find it a satisfactory and desirable professional tool, and to the latter it will be entertaining, instructive, and valuable for reference. It is well printed and indexed, and has a short bibliography.

WALTER B. DOUGLAS.

Semi-Centennial History of the University of Illinois. Volume I. The Movement for Industrial Education and the Establishment of the University. By BURT E. POWELL, University Historian, with an Introduction by EDMUND J. JAMES, Ph.D., LL.D., fourth President of the University. (Urbana: the University. 1918. Pp. xxii, 631. \$2.00.)

THE state universities of America constitute the largest group of higher educational institutions of learning of a given type that are to be found in any country. While of a distinct type they vary not only in size, offering, and fields of peculiar excellence or specialization, but somewhat also in their peculiar interpretation of education as a state process or in the part which they have played in the evolution of American education. Thus the University of Virginia first broke with the traditional scholastic education and traditional type of administration, introducing, as it has continued to exemplify, democratic principles of control and operation not yet realized to any great extent in other institutions. In a similar way the University of Michigan first demon-

strated that the entire field of higher and professional education was within the scope of the state university, and that this scope was limited only by the technical and social needs of the body politic.

The outstanding merit of the volume under review is that it makes clear, as has not been done before, that the University of Illinois was the first realization of an industrial university—that is, one designed primarily for the training of the industrial classes in technical and agricultural lines rather than of the select or socially favored classes in the traditional “learned” professions. While the university was not opened until 1868 the agitation for its foundation along these lines began in 1852. This volume clearly indicates, though perhaps it is not demonstrated beyond controversy, that the Morrill Act of 1862 for the founding of mechanical and agricultural colleges in each state had its origin in the Illinois proposition.

Consequently a most valuable part of the volume is the documents, twenty-nine in all, constituting the appendix. These documents include the original plan of 1852, the opposition arguments put forth by the colleges of the traditional type, the memorials to the legislature and to Congress, and the resulting state and federal laws.

If there is any criticism to pass on the volume, it would be on the opening chapter which traces “the beginning of the struggle”. The idea of an industrial and agricultural type of education did not originate nor did the agitation begin with the agricultural societies of New York and New England in the fifth and sixth decades of the nineteenth century. The proceedings of the American Philosophical Society during the last decade of the eighteenth and the early decades of the nineteenth contain many discussions of the same idea. The Manual Labor Institutes of the early half of the nineteenth century, originating with the parent institution of von Fellenberg founded in Switzerland in 1809, were superficial attempts at the same end. The plans of Benjamin Franklin and of Provost Smith in his College of Mirania in the middle of the eighteenth century, not to mention earlier European ones, were attempts at the realization of the same ideal. Such abortive attempts, however, detract nothing from the merits of the successful Illinois efforts.

The volume is in excellent temper and form. It is written in the spirit of the investigator, not in that of a press agent, as is so often true of the histories of educational institutions. PAUL MONROE.

Evolution of the Dominion of Canada: Its Government and Its Politics. By EDWARD PORRITT. [Government Handbooks edited by David P. Barrows and Thomas H. Reed.] (Yonkers-on-Hudson: World Book Company. 1918. Pp. xix, 540. \$1.50.)

MR. PORRITT's book is difficult to classify. It is more than a description of the government of Canada, if the plan of such books as Bryce's

The American Commonwealth or Lowell's *The Government of England* may be taken as a criterion; for it contains not only a survey of the present-day constitutional arrangements in Canada but also a sketch of Canadian constitutional history since 1783, as well as some political and economic history. On the other hand, it falls short of being a constitutional history of Canada; for to ignore everything in Canadian history before 1783, including not only the French period but also those years pregnant with fate which followed the British conquest, is to miss the factors which have conditioned the whole of Canadian development. Perhaps it may best be described as an *olla podrida* of which the ingredients are government and constitutional history, with dashes of economic and political history thrown in.

Mr. Porritt would have been well advised if he had omitted the historical portions of his book. Not only are they unnecessary in a handbook on government, but they are unworthy of the rest of the book. Mr. Porritt's familiarity with Canadian history is hardly such as to justify him in writing about it. His statement that from 1763 to 1774 Quebec was under "military rule" (p. 66) reveals an amazing ignorance of the early days of British rule in Canada. To say that the Quebec Act of 1774 "recognized and continued the Roman Catholic church in Quebec as an established church" (p. 65) is hardly accurate; at best it was an endowed church. The ruling classes in the provinces of Lower Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia from 1820 to 1840 were not known as the "Family Compacts" (p. 72); it was only in Upper Canada that the term was in use, and it did not become frequent even there until after 1833. William Lyon Mackenzie was not expelled from the assembly in 1832 "for publishing the division lists" (p. 92); his offense was publishing the journals of the house without the appendixes. And the governor to whom his constituents appealed, and who replied with a curt sentence which Mr. Porritt misquotes, was Colborne, not Head (p. 92). It is simply not true that either Mackenzie or Papineau demanded responsible government as we understand it (p. 93); just as it is not true that Sydenham "established cabinet government in Canada on the same basis as at Westminster" (p. 112). Such views are the result of a serious misreading of Canadian constitutional development. No less deplorable than his mistakes are Mr. Porritt's omissions. He discusses the politics of the Union period without mention of the double-majority principle. Even when dealing with the period since 1867, where he treads with surer foot, Mr. Porritt says nothing about the long struggle in the courts about provincial rights. He discusses the office of the governor-general, but fails to touch on the ambassadorial, as distinct from the vice-regal, aspects of the office. In tracing the growth of Canadian autonomy, he omits all reference to assumption by Canada of military and naval defense. Everywhere he relies on secondary authorities, not always of a trustworthy nature. One of his

authorities, from which he draws several erroneous statements, is Miss Weaver's *A Canadian History for Boys and Girls*, though it appears in his bibliography merely as *A Canadian History*.

These are grave defects. They do not, however, invalidate the claim of the book to value. Mr. Porritt, who is an Englishman resident in the United States, has been able to approach his study of Canadian institutions from a fresh and original standpoint. He is particularly good when dealing, as he does at some length, with the British background of Canadian history, with the imperial significance of Canadian development, and with the influence of the United States on Canada. In this respect his book is a useful corrective to the too intense particularism of many Canadian writers. Nor should a word of cordial praise be withheld from his clear and interesting, if somewhat journalistic, account of the working of the federal government at Ottawa. Here his pages are a distinct improvement on the only other book in the field, Sir John Bourinot's *How Canada is Governed*.

W. STEWART WALLACE.

Rise of the Spanish-American Republics as told in the Lives of their Liberators. By WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History in the University of Illinois. (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company. 1918. Pp. xvi, 380. \$3.00.)

THE first work to be published in English on the general subject of the struggle that freed half of the New World from the power of Spain is bound to possess an interest apart from its actual merits. Written, moreover, by a scholar who has specialized in the field of Hispanic-American history, and devoid of the fierce partizanship that marks so many of the literary productions of the descendants of the men who fought in the conflict, its attraction to the student of the period is manifest.

Of the nine chapters in the book the first, under the caption of the Historical Background, sketches the three centuries of Spanish rule. The seven chapters that follow are devoted, respectively, to Miranda, Hidalgo, Iturbide, Moreno, San Martín, "de Bolívar", and Sucre. In point of time they deal with "a distinct period in the history of Spanish America, the transitional epoch from 1808 to 1831, which may be said to lie between the colonial period proper and the distinctly national period" (page xi). The treatment is not designed to portray the career of a single individual, or the fortunes of a single rising state, so much as to describe a revolutionary movement in which a commanding personage had the most important share. With the seven liberators in question are associated certain minor characters, like Artigas, Francia, Santander, and O'Higgins, whose deeds concerned particular countries rather than the broad sweep of the wars of emancipation. A brief con-

cluding chapter summarizes the causes for the revolt against Spanish domination, contrasts it with the American Revolution, and discusses the process of economic and social reorganization attendant upon the achievement of independence, the relations of the new nations with Great Britain and the United States, and the eventual recognition accorded the Spanish-American republics by the erstwhile mother country. A "select bibliography" of several hundred titles is appended. The volume contains two maps, also, and a dozen portraits.

While according the fullest measure of appreciation to Professor Robertson's labor of research, his conscientious erudition, and the real service he has conferred in depicting for English readers the life and times of seven eminent soldiers and statesmen of Spanish America, the reviewer must express his lack of agreement with the way in which the subject has been handled. If the scope of the initial chapter had been confined to a study of the situation in the colonies during the fifty years or so preceding the outbreak of revolution, instead of ranging backward over several centuries, its picture of conditions might have been more accurate and intelligible. Even if there were no positive errors in the account, the significance of the entire period of Spanish rule could not possibly be rendered clear in twenty-five pages. It is a venturesome thing, surely, to make Iturbide a "liberator" of Mexico and reprove the Mexican people for not so regarding him. Had the concluding chapter been given over to a comparative characterization of the seven commanding personages, and not to an analysis of the causes of the revolution, which would belong presumably in an introduction of some sort, and not to a treatment, also, of various matters that in part might have been incorporated in the text proper, and in part omitted as on the whole irrelevant, it would have rounded out the work more satisfactorily. In the interest of literary charm, the details provided in many places might have been less minute and the statements less precise in their mode of presentation. Though the bibliography is supposed to be annotated, more than half of the titles are without comment of any kind.

From the author's opinion, finally, that certain difficulties inherent in the complexity of the theme, which deals with the emergence of eleven republics, have been "lessened by the use of what may be styled the biographical method" (page ix), the reviewer dissents absolutely. Just because of this complexity of the theme, couched in terms of geography, chronology, personality, and circumstance, he believes that the rise of the Spanish-American republics cannot be told in the lives of their liberators—much less in fact than that the separation of the thirteen colonies of North America from the British empire of the time can be told in the lives of Washington and his fellow liberators.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

MINOR NOTICES

An Abbot of Vézelay. By Rose Graham, F. R. H. S., Membre Associé de l'Académie de Macon. [Studies in Church History.] (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1918, pp. iv, 136, 3 sh. 6 d.) Vézelay, it is well known, was a place of some importance in the twelfth century. It lay near one of the main north-and-south routes through France, on the bridge between the valleys of the Seine and the Loire. The monastery established on the summit of the hill there, toward the end of the ninth century, was thought to have the relics of St. Mary Magdalen; so Vézelay prospered greatly from pilgrimage. By the time Louis VII. and Bernard of Clairvaux were inaugurating at Vézelay the so-called second crusade, the population of the town numbered possibly as many as ten thousand.

It is well known also that the monastery of Vézelay, in this same twelfth century, was involved in various strifes—with the powerful Count of Nevers, with the Bishop of Autun, and with the inhabitants of the place. These matters were written down afterward, at considerable length, by one of the monks, a certain Hugh of Poitiers, and the greater part of Hugh's account was published by Dom Luc d'Achery in his *Spicilegium*, and later in popular form by Guizot in the *Collection des Mémoires*. Thierry used this account toward the twenty-second, twenty-third, and twenty-fourth of his *Lettres*. In 1851, Monsieur L. de Bastard, in the *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, criticized the account by Thierry. Then, in the sixties, Monsieur Aimé Cherest brought out an exhaustive study on Vézelay, in three volumes.

In what Miss Graham has now done, there is little or no appeal to the investigative student. A brief, scholarly account especially of the greatest of the abbots of Vézelay and of various happenings under him—such an account as might serve well a modern traveller to Vézelay, in conjunction with the little book by Charles Porée on the abbey church there—so much she has surely accomplished. Also, she has increased serviceably the reading available in English for individual or class use, with reference to monastic history to be sure, but as well with reference to the struggles and fortunes of townspeople in the midst of feudalism.

E. W. Dow.

The Ta'rikh-i-Jahán-Gushá of 'Alá'u 'd-Dín 'atá Malik-i-Juwaynî (composed in A. H. 658 = A. D. 1260). Part I., containing the History of Chingiz Khán and his Successors; Part II., containing the History of the Khwárazm-Sháh Dynasty. Edited with an Introduction, Notes, and Indices by MÍRZÁ MUḤAMMAD, IBN 'ABDU'L-WAHHÁB-I-QAZWÍNÍ. [E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, vol. XVI., parts I. and II.] (Leyden, E. J. Brill; London, Luzac and Company, 1912, 1916, pp. xciv, 128, 292; xvi, 24, 358. 8 sh. each.) It is indeed a remarkable fact, as Professor

Browne points out in the introduction to volume I., that, although the importance of the *Ta'rikh-i-Jahān-Gushā* has long been recognized in the West, no complete edition of the text has ever been attempted. The thanks of scholars are therefore due to Professor Browne and the rest of the Gibb Trustees for their decision to make accessible to all readers of Persian the entire text of this celebrated history. These two volumes are the result of this decision and reproduce the text of two of the three volumes into which the history was divided. The second of the present volumes was delayed by the war, and Professor Browne, writing in 1916 (see preface to vol. II., p. xiii.), says that the appearance of the third "must for the present be regarded as indefinitely postponed". While final comment must be reserved till the last volume of the work is published, it is clear that Professor Browne and Mīrzā Muḥammad have rendered a real service by editing this work. Nor is this service rendered only to readers of Persian, for although the text itself and the long introduction which Mīrzā Muḥammad has prefixed to the two volumes are in Persian (with the exception of extracts from certain Arabic authors), Professor Browne, mindful of those to whom he felicitously refers as "those who read Persian with less ease than English", has given in the long English introduction prefixed to volume I., "in a somewhat abridged and simplified form", "the substance of his (Mīrzā Muḥammad's) conclusions", together with material of his own. In this introduction, which is evidently the result of careful investigation, the student will find many interesting and valuable details regarding the life and times of the author, his family, the date and composition of his great history, the manuscripts on which this edition is based, and related subjects. Moreover the facsimiles, of which several are given in each volume, reproducing, as the majority of them do, miniatures with which the pages of the manuscripts are adorned, are a welcome addition, and will be studied with interest by some whose interest in the details of Mongol history may be rather languid.

Professor Browne has prefixed a short English preface to volume II.

The volumes are provided with Persian indexes of persons, places, tribes, etc., and these indexes seem to have been prepared with care. The text is well printed on good paper. Mīrzā Muḥammad, Professor Browne, and his fellow trustees of the Gibb Memorial are to be congratulated on the publication of these volumes and may feel assured that scholars will hope that the third and concluding volume will appear much sooner than seemed possible in 1916.

J. R. JEWETT.

The Household of a Tudor Nobleman. By Paul V. B. Jones, Associate in History in the University of Illinois. [University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. VI., no. 4.] (Urbana, the University, 1917, pp. 277, \$1.50.) The households of the Tudor noblemen

were at once the central offices of the local magnates and captains of agriculture, and the highest development of refinement and amenities in sixteenth-century English life. Of these great establishments, the "central institutions in the life of that age, from whatsoever aspect—social, intellectual, economic or other—it be viewed", no adequate study has been made, though some references occur in social histories, like Miss Bateson's chapters in Traill's *Social England*. A wealth of material is available in nearly a score of printed household account-books and household regulation books of the great Tudor noble houses, dating from 1462 to 1640. These Dr. Jones has carefully studied, and combined the results with other material into this most valuable essay.

The personnel of the household, the duties of the servants, the food in its Gargantuan quantity and endless variety, the elaborate ceremonial at dinner, the worship in the household chapel—with the sharp contrast and change introduced there by the Reformation—and the capitalization of religion as a means of keeping servants in order, the diverting excitement of moving the household from one great residence to another, with long lines of creaking wagons to carry the household stuff, the delight in the music of the children of the chapel and the hired musicians, the visits of travelling actors, and the purchase of books, are admirably set forth. The chapter on financial management gives a rather detailed account of the functions of the surveyors, auditors, and receivers of the landed estates, which, since the practice in the noble households was similar to that in the royal establishment, is helpful for a study of the national revenue organization. The two chapters on the purveyance of supplies, detailing the amount of supplies needed and their cost, have much meaty matter regarding the part of the demesne fields in the household economy, and the organization of buying and selling, in fairs and from merchants in London and in the county towns.

At times one feels that some of the wealth of illustrative material properly belongs in the foot-notes, which Dr. Jones uses chiefly for the indication of references. Too frequent quotations in involved Tudor prose, moreover, give a touch of heaviness to some pages of this scholarly contribution to Tudor social history. FREDERICK C. DIETZ.

Three Centuries of Treaties of Peace and their Teaching. By the Right Hon. Sir Walter George Frank Phillimore, Bart. (London, John Murray, 1917, pp. xvi, 227, 7 sh. 6 d.) Within the limits of one hundred and seventy-eight pages the distinguished author has undertaken to describe certain aspects of treaties of peace of the past three centuries, to point out stipulations which have brought about fresh conflicts, to offer constructive suggestions as to the terms of the treaty which shall mark the conclusion of the present war, and incidentally to discuss conventions concerning the laws of war.

Announcing at the outset nine maxims regarded as the "foundations of treaties", the author has tested the compacts of belligerent states

accordingly. He refers to the doctrine of the balance of power as a more useful alternative than a league of peace. The lessons supplied by treaties from 1648 to 1815 are briefly dealt with and summarized. The legacies and failures of the Congress of Vienna, and the treaty of Frankfort, and the half-measures of the treaties of Paris, of Berlin, and of Bucharest, are skillfully portrayed.

It is declared that "this war has taught us that neutralisation of states is no good", and it is intimated that a reconstituted Belgium might well be freed from its position of neutrality, and have annexed to it Luxemburg as well as such a strip of Zeeland as would give Belgium one bank of the West Scheldt to the sea. The author utters warning that "the annexation of an unwilling nationality, whether as subject to, or in forcible union with, another nationality, gains no strength from its being ratified in a treaty". He would apply this principle faithfully in ascertaining the transferability of territory the cession of which may be demanded in consequence of the present war. Several proposals are made with respect to the equities of particular states now in alliance with Great Britain. There is advocated an enlargement of the belligerent right of capture by the abrogation of the provisions of the Declaration of Paris. Possibly lack of space has deterred the author from discussing thoroughly or broadly the rules of maritime warfare of which the very treatment marks a digression from his main theme. In his commentary on the effects produced by numerous treaties of peace concluded by European powers, he has shown the real significance of those war-producing seeds likely to be sown by any compact terminating an international conflict, unless scrupulous regard be had for the reasonable aspirations of existing nationalities, and the normal requirements of independent states. The chapters on the Congress of Vienna, the Making of Italy, and the Remaking of Germany justify the book. It is an illuminating treatise written by one possessed of close knowledge of European affairs, and whose conclusions demand careful examination.

The suggestion that the Spanish-American peace negotiations in 1898 afforded an instance of informal mediation because Paris, a city in a neutral state, was chosen as a meeting place (p. 11), seems unfortunate. The treaty of commerce between the United States and the Argentine Confederation was concluded in 1853, not 1843 (pp. 116, 182).

A chronological list of treaties to which reference is made in the text, and a comprehensive index are appended.

Beaumarchais and the War of American Independence. By Elizabeth S. K te. In two volumes. (Boston, Richard G. Badger, 1918, pp. 308, 366. \$5.00.) This work was first prepared in 1906. Its publication at the present time was stimulated by the author's desire to stir appreciation of the debt which America owes Beaumarchais and through him to France. From this point of view the work is thoroughly acceptable,

though it must be said that it adds little to our previous knowledge of the subject.

Miss Kite is disposed, I think, to exaggerate considerably the importance of Beaumarchais's initiative in the matter of secret aid to the colonies, while she overlooks his significance as the point of contact between popular enthusiasm for the American cause and the cold plotting of the Foreign Office. Her position with regard to the "lost million" is grounded on the Duc de Richelieu's assurance in 1816 that Beaumarchais's transactions with the colonies "were spontaneous on the part of M. de Beaumarchais"—an explanation rightly rejected by Loménie as entirely misleading. It seems probable that the "lost million" was originally intended by the king as a gratuity to the Americans (see, *e. g.*, Doniol, II. 713), but that Vergennes considered it available as a reward to Beaumarchais for his proselyting work with Louis in behalf of American intervention and for other services. It must be owned, however, that the American Congress would have appeared in much better light if it had accepted the French government's explanations in this matter at the outset without further curiosity or suspicion.

The work contains a foreword by the Hon. James M. Beck, in which we are informed that Beaumarchais was a Richard Brinsley Sheridan, a Junius, a Harriman, a Sherlock Holmes, and a Talleyrand all wrapped in one package. One is reminded of the story of the little girl, who, contemplating herself and her father in the mirror, inquired with some complacency: "Papa, why is it that God turns out so much better work at some times than at others?"

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

The Vandal of Europe: an Exposé of the Inner Workings of Germany's Policy of World Domination and its Brutalizing Consequences. By Wilhelm Mühlton, translated with an introduction by William L. McPherson. (New York and London, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1918, pp. 335, \$1.50.) This work, which shared with Lichnowsky's memorandum official condemnation before the Reichstag, was first published in Switzerland in March of the present year. It consists of extracts from the diary of the author for the last half of the year 1914. It is not a diary in the ordinary sense but rather a commentary on conditions and events, written with rare objectivity.

Little is known of the author, outside of Germany. He speaks of himself as a Bavarian. Possibly he is identical with the Wilhelm Muehlton whose doctoral dissertation was published at the University of Würzburg in 1904. His position as a director of Krupps proved distasteful to him, and his resignation was finally accepted toward the end of the year 1914. Later he appears to have represented the German government on a special mission in Rumania until that country entered the war in 1917. Thereafter he withdrew to Switzerland, where he has since resided. From his published letter to Bethmann-Hollweg it would

seem that he sought to act as an agent of the German government in arranging a mutually honorable peace with the Allies. Failing, however, to win the German officials to this purpose, he engaged in a campaign of open criticism against the forces controlling Germany's politics. Of this the publication of this diary and his even more pointed letters are a part.

His distaste for his position with the Krupps was due in large part to the fact that it was leading almost inevitably to war, for which he had the aversion not only of a business man but also of an intellectual internationalist. Furthermore as a Bavarian he was none too fond of the harsh Prussian militarism, which to him seemed brutal and degrading. As a director of Krupps he was thrown into intimate contact with the men responsible for Germany's policies. He quotes their conversation without mentioning names, a fault which he has corrected in his more recent letters.

Most of the facts which he mentions are drawn from hearsay. It is only regarding the German-Belgian pre-war relations and the designs of the German "steel-ring" upon conquered territory that he affords any appreciable new evidence. The amassing of facts, however, is not the chief value of his work. That lies rather in his commentaries upon the facts. His analysis of German opinion toward the war, his judgment upon international relationship, and his diagnosis of local situations in Austria, Italy, Rumania, and the Balkans generally, are unusually keen. There is little evidence of malice or spite in the work. It is the statement of difference of opinion, though fundamental in this respect, from that held by the ruling powers in his country. While his comments do not quite constitute an official disclosure, they fall but little short of that, and as an aid in the interpretation of events in Germany and on the Continent they cannot be ignored by any serious student of the war.

History of the World War. Volume II. The Making of Middle Europe. By Frank H. Simonds. (New York, Doubleday, Page, and Company, 1918, pp. xv, 253, \$3.50.) Mr. Simonds's second volume deals chiefly with the military operations between April and December, 1915, and takes its title, *The Making of Middle Europe*, from their outstanding result.

Several chapters, however, survey the course of the war elsewhere than on the European battle-fronts. One discusses the transformation of the war from one between two rival groups of powers to one in defense of civilization. A second briefly sketches the naval operations of 1914 and 1915. In this the author, following an unjustifiable popular usage, refers to warships as *boats*. A third traces the fall of Germany's colonial empire, and does full justice to the work of the British fleet, whose value "cannot be exaggerated". The blockade and the first phase of the submarine question are discussed with severe impartiality.

For Simonds, the sinking of the *Lusitania* was the deciding factor in inducing the United States to endure Allied infractions of international law in enforcing their blockade, while challenging the German submarine activities.

Germany, having failed to crush France in 1914, turned to the East and in 1915 realized the Berlin-Bagdad dream by overwhelming Russia, occupying Serbia, and placing herself in control of the resources and armies of her allies, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey. This eastern offensive began with the Russian defeat at the Dunajec on May 1, and ended with the conclusion of the Balkan campaign on November 28. The Dunajec Simonds ranks with the Marne and Verdun as one of the decisive battles of the war. It saved Austria and initiated the Russian military collapse, itself a prelude to the Russian revolution. Only a successful Franco-British offensive in the West could have saved Russia. But the event justified the decision of the German General Staff to remain on the defensive there, for, prepared for trench warfare, and having abundant heavy artillery, machine guns, trench mortars, and hand-grenades, they withstood both the spring and autumn offensives of the Allies.

Simonds has nothing but contempt for the way in which Grey and Delcassé handled the Balkan problem. They were idealists, whereas the situation required realists. But his severest strictures are reserved for the "Sicilian venture" at Gallipoli. After the failure of the naval attack, any further assault was doomed to failure. The divisions thrown away at Gallipoli by the decision of Churchill, "the civilian strategist", could have won a decisive victory at Loos, or rescued the Serbian army.

In conclusion the author rightly emphasizes misconceptions which each of the warring groups entertained regarding the other at the close of the year. The Allies failed to realize the magnitude of the German conquests, and to see that Germany was united, victorious, enthusiastic for the empire she had won, and confident of reaching early a decisive issue. And the Germans equally failed to see that, with all their successes, they had not succeeded in destroying their enemies' power nor in breaking their determination to conquer.

Altogether, in lucidity, conciseness, comprehensiveness, and sound judgment, this volume is a worthy successor of the first.

A. E. R. BOAK.

Commerce and the Empire, 1914 and After. By Edward Pulsford. (London, P. S. King and Son, Limited, 1917, pp. x, 248, 7 sh. 6 d.) From 1846 to 1895—almost from the passing of the enabling act at Westminster in 1846, to the last and final amendment to the fiscal powers section of the Australian colonies government act of 1850—a propaganda was waged from the Colonial Office in Downing Street for tariffs in all the self-governing colonies that should be based, like the tariff of the United Kingdom, on free trade. The history of this propaganda—a

history that has yet to be written—is a history of complete failure. The United Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada between 1850 and 1867 enacted tariffs with both discriminatory and differential duties. Retaliatory duties were enacted at Ottawa within three years after confederation. About this time Victoria and New Zealand adopted protectionist tariffs. Other of the Australian colonies followed their example. Later on, Cape Colony and Natal went over to protection; and the propaganda of 1846 was in the end so complete a failure that to-day Newfoundland is the only one of the five oversea dominions of Great Britain in which there is no protectionist tariff.

Despite this record of failure for the propaganda of 1846-1895, Mr. Pulsford, who is a member of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Australia, is still convinced that it is possible gradually to bring tariff policy in Australasia into line with British principles of freedom of commerce. Evidently he sees hope where Grey, Newcastle, and Kimberley, and other secretaries of state for the colonies in the years from 1846 to 1895, encountered nothing but failure. His treatise is written in this spirit; and apparently he is confident that free trade in the United Kingdom will survive the war; for he insists that when a country is being taxed right up to the hilt, when the public tax-gatherer seems never to be off the doorstep—as is the case now in the United Kingdom, and will be the case for a generation after the war—"the establishment of a small army of private tax-gatherers, authorized by act of Parliament to plunder on their own account", will be a condition which the people of the United Kingdom will not tolerate. The writer of this note is as much a convinced free-trader as Mr. Pulsford. He wishes he could be as confident as Mr. Pulsford is about the future of free trade in Great Britain. In the meantime students of the fiscal systems of Great Britain and of the oversea dominions who hold the views of Mr. Pulsford, and of the writer of this note, are indebted to Mr. Pulsford for this contribution to the literature of the free-trade movement in the British Empire; and in particular for Mr. Pulsford's detailed examination—an examination which extends to a little over one hundred pages—of the system of preferences which Canada revived in the tariff act of 1897.

E. P.

German Submarine Warfare: a Study of its Methods and Spirit. By Wesley Frost, United States Consul, formerly stationed at Queenstown. (New York, Appleton, 1918, pp. xvii, 243.) For the history of the operations of German submarines off the southern Irish coast, and for somewhat more, this is a book of first-rate importance. No one had better opportunities to know the actual facts of German submarine warfare than Mr. Wesley Frost, whose work as United States consul at Queenstown was so valuable in connection with those operations and so highly commended by the Department of State. Of the exploits and crimes of submarines, a much greater number occurred within his juris-

diction than in that of any other American consul. His pages are founded on careful official investigations of scores of cases, and on numberless affidavits. Naturally, the case of the *Lusitania* is treated with especial fullness. The restraint and sobriety of Mr. Frost's statements, despite a somewhat contorted style, add great force to his narrative. It is a record of lawlessness and inhumanity which history will never forget. No reader of newspapers need think he has seen the story in anything like the whole of its blackness till he has read this sober and competent but moving little book.

Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society. Number 26. (New York, the Society, 1918, pp. xxix, 362.) The present volume of this useful and learned society covers the proceedings of its twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth annual meetings, including, in the case of the former, some matter commemorating the society's twenty-fifth anniversary and referring to its achievements, which have been distinctly notable. The first of the substantive papers in the volume is an excellent discourse on the aims and tasks of Jewish historiography, by Professor Alexander Marx, of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York. The next paper in the volume is one by Mr. Max J. Kohler on Jewish Rights at the Congresses of Vienna and Aix-la-Chapelle. It is written with much learning and upon the basis of very careful researches, though not so arranged or composed as to make easy reading. In an appendix Mr. Kohler presents a draft of a new system of legislation for the Jews, July 17, 1809, prepared by Wilhelm von Humboldt. Mr. Albert M. Hyamson reviews the long series of British Projects for the Restoration of Jews to Palestine. Mr. Leon Hühner presents a body of details respecting the service of Jews in the War of 1812. Mr. L. M. Friedman writes of the relations of Cotton Mather to the Jews. These major papers are followed by a long series of smaller contributions designated as notes, often of much interest.

Massachusetts Historical Society, Proceedings, October, 1917-June, 1918. Volume LI. (Boston, the Society, 1918, pp. xvi, 522.) In this new volume of a famous old society, the two chief elements are two journals of public men of the early days of the republic. The longer (129 pp.) is one kept in 1818 and 1819 by Jonathan Russell, then United States minister to Sweden, covering a journey from Stockholm through Germany, Austria, and Italy as far as Naples. It is an entertaining narrative, with full and often interesting descriptions of antiquities and paintings, but if the writer had any high degree of political intelligence the journal bears no trace of it. Russell talked with Blücher and Gneisenau, Metternich and Stadion, Francis I. and Marie Louise, Niebuhr and Lucien Bonaparte and Madame Letitia, but if any of them said anything interesting he does not record it, and the historical value of his journal is not great. Of more importance is that of William

Loughton Smith of South Carolina, Federalist member of Congress, relating to journeys in New England in 1790 and from Philadelphia to Charleston in 1791. Smith was a man of ability, observant and intelligent. Mr. Albert Matthews narrates his life, gives his bibliography, and distinguishes him carefully from other William Smiths with whom he has been sadly confused. An account of Joseph Badger, a worthy Boston artist of moderate talent who painted portraits between 1740 and 1765, is contributed by Mr. Lawrence Park. A descriptive list of Badger's work is added, and is accompanied by excellent reproductions of seven of his portraits. Mr. Chester N. Greenough has a learned paper on Algernon Sidney and the Motto of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Mr. W. C. Ford casts new light, from Virginian records, on Captain Wollaston and Thomas Weston of early Massachusetts. The chief memoirs are of Professor W. W. Goodwin, of Richard Olney, and of F. B. Sanborn.

Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D. C. Volume 21. (Washington, the Society, 1918, pp. vi, 401.) Most of the matter in this volume is, naturally, occupied with local and even antiquarian topics, biographical sketches of persons active in the affairs of the District of Columbia rather than in those of the United States, and similar contributions. Three papers, however, have in part a wider range. Rev. Dr. George Williamson Smith, formerly president of Trinity College, who in March and April, 1861, was in the Navy Department at Washington, casts interesting light upon the situation of the capital city in those anxious weeks, in a paper entitled *A Critical Moment for Washington*. Major Gist Blair, in the course of a paper called *Annals of Silver Spring*, gives many interesting biographical details respecting Francis P. Blair and Montgomery Blair, and prints a long letter of Mrs. Jefferson Davis to the latter written in May, 1865, and hitherto unprinted, in which she describes fully the events attending the flight and capture of her husband. In view of the immense importance which the work of the American Red Cross has assumed, much historical value attaches also to a paper on Miss Clara Barton, prepared by the late Mrs. Corra Bacon-Foster.

The Papers of Thomas Ruffin. Collected and edited by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, Ph.D., Alumni Professor of History in the University of North Carolina. Volume I. (Raleigh, North Carolina Historical Commission, 1918, pp. 541.) Thomas Ruffin (1787-1870), chief justice of North Carolina from 1833 to 1852, a prominent Whig during most of his life, and an earnest opponent of secession in 1860, was a man whose correspondence must yield something of value to the historian. If to this it be added that Ruffin was to the conservatives of North Carolina what Chief Justice Marshall was to conservatives of the country, no question will be raised as to the importance of this pub-

lication. And it should be said at the beginning that the work of the editor, Professor J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, is admirably done.

This volume gives the letters of Ruffin and to Ruffin covering the period from 1803 to 1830; but there are only twenty-nine of the former, while there are more than 450 of the latter. The volume also contains an address of William A. Graham on Ruffin and a short biography by Professor Hamilton himself. These sketches give a fair, but insufficient, view of the career of the man whose correspondence we now have. It is to be hoped that some North Carolina scholar will now undertake to present the great judge in fuller form.

Although this collection of Ruffin *Papers* does not offer any letters from the great national leaders of the Whig party, it does present very many letters from all the North Carolina Whigs of prominence. It is an interesting and important social group we have represented here for the first time in their best forms, those men to whom Fisher Ames's remark about "the rich, the wise, and the good" might apply—the Camerons, Hendersons, Haywoods, Grahams, and Mangums. If one wishes to learn what the most intelligent and the wealthiest North Carolinians thought about public matters, these letters are apt to supply the need.

And there are topics enough: the tariff agitation, the Crawford and Calhoun manoeuvres, and the election of Andrew Jackson. A number of the letters from senators and representatives in Congress give intimate accounts of events and conditions in Washington. But it is clear that the second volume of these *Papers* must be the more important one. The North Carolina Historical Commission, though late in the field, is using its resources to the best advantage.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

Western Influence on Political Parties to 1825: an Essay in Historical Interpretation. By Homer C. Hockett, Professor of American History in the Ohio State University. [Ohio State University Bulletin, vol. XXII., no. 3, Contributions in History and Political Science, no. 4.] (Columbus, the University, 1917, pp. 157, \$1.00.) The five chapters of this study by Professor Hockett are designed to prove that "in Europe political parties have divided in the main along lines of social stratification; in the United States the lines of cleavage have tended to be political" (p. 9), and that "both the Federalist and Republican parties based on conditions connected with the geographical development of the United States up to the beginning of the constitutional period were destroyed before 1825 in consequence of the changes incident to further geographical development". It is really a study in economic politics, elaborating a familiar thesis, reinforced with judicious citations from newspapers and documents, and demonstrating anew that the alignment of parties in the United States has been determined by economic conditions rather than by abstract principles or theories, from the political

agriculturism of Thomas Jefferson to the bimetallism of William Jennings Bryan. The writer of this study has not kept clear the distinction between geographical influences and economic influences. The former must in the nature of things be permanent and inescapable; the latter arise out of variable and temporary conditions in an area like Massachusetts, Ohio, or South Carolina. The aspect or political mood of Ohio or South Carolina in relation to the whole United States changed greatly from 1820 to 1900, but the differences were due to changes in industry, economic organization, and distribution of population. Unquestionably the best part of this study is section II., Development of Economic Life and Thought of the West (chapter IV., The Disruption of the Republican Party), which is admirably worked out with skillful use of original material, particularly that derived from Ohio.

This study as the successor of three studies of the Loyalists of the Revolutionary period in itself illustrates western influences on historical scholarship.

KENDRIC C. BABCOCK.

The Political History of the Public Lands from 1840 to 1862: from Pre-emption to Homestead. By George M. Stephenson, Ph.D., Instructor in History in Dartmouth College. (Boston, Richard G. Badger; Toronto, Copp Clark Company, 1917, pp. 296, \$2.50.) The political, economic, and social importance of the public lands has long been recognized, and in recent years has been intensively investigated from various points of view. Dr. Stephenson's book adds another to the chronological treatments of the subject. He has endeavored "to trace the history of the public land legislation in Congress, to portray the sentiment of the different sections of the country relative to the disposal of the public domain, and to estimate the influence of the public lands on the political and legislative situation in general, in the period from 1840 to 1862". The author's chief contribution is a thoroughgoing exposition of the homestead movement—its beginnings in the minds of western pioneers, eastern labor leaders and reformers; organized agitation when it was seen that pre-emption did not eliminate the speculator; the long struggle in Congress in face of the opposition of the southern slavocracy and the supporters of land warrants and grants to railroads; its powerful influence for Lincoln in the election of 1860, and its final passage in 1862.

The introductory chapter on sectionalism and the public lands, 1835-1845, is superficial and contains errors. Bepton's graduation bill was first introduced in 1824, not 1826 (p. 26); Calhoun was not an opponent of distribution in 1833 (p. 31); the treatment of Calhoun's cession plan is misleading in not distinguishing his separate bill of February 9 from his amendment of February 7 to Morris's bill restricting the sale of public lands to actual settlers (pp. 33-37); and a quotation on the South-and-West alliance of the late 1820's is applied to 1837 (p. 36). Little new material is added for the years 1840 to 1842.

The investigation is based chiefly on the government documents, especially the *Congressional Globe*, contemporary writings, and a vast number of newspapers, representing all sections of the country. With the exception of some short chapters which might well have been incorporated in others, as for example chapter VIII. and chapter X., the material has been well organized and clearly and aptly expressed. Eight maps showing the vote on the various measures are valuable additions. The book is provided with a good index.

RAYNOR G. WELLINGTON.

Lincoln in Illinois. By Octavia Roberts. (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1918, pp. 119, \$5.00.) This handsome volume submits to the public a high class of folk-lore centring about Lincoln and his Illinois friends and associates. It draws upon that romantic storehouse of historical by-products that so often remains even after a portrait of a great historical personality has been repeatedly "done" in history and biography. The memories treasured by Lincoln's townsmen, together with an historical imagination stimulated by long association with the haunts of Lincoln, have encouraged the author to undertake to re-create the human background in which Lincoln moved during the greater part of his life. There is real charm in the pictures of the great commoner in the every-day surroundings of the Illinois prairies. Yet there is little of the Calvinism which so frequently flavors the fond memories of the octogenarian reminiscencer. The Lincoln here pictured is not the predestined savior of the nation, impatiently working toward the tragedy of his martyrdom; it is rather the man Lincoln portrayed with the well-known frailties of the flesh and not a few of those of the spirit. The "long-legged fellow" who pilots the *Talisman* from Beardstown to Springfield, the store-keeper at New Salem, the lawyer at Springfield, and the human and wily Whig and Republican politician show a character different from his fellows not so much in quality as in the degree in which he was able to surpass them.

ARTHUR C. COLE.

The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale. By Edward E. Hale, jr. In two volumes. (Boston, Little, Brown, and Company, 1917, pp. vi, 390; 442, \$5.00.) In two handsome volumes Professor Edward E. Hale of Union College gives an ample and leisurely account of his distinguished father. If a stranger to the subject finds the scale of the work disproportionate to the amount of material significant for historical record, he will in the end justify the reverent love that uses whatever detail of letter and diary to express and preserve the personality of Dr. Hale, for, as this biography shows, Dr. Hale had greatness as a personality and left the impress of his moral will upon the social movement. He was not a publicist or statesman, though always active in

public interests and an associate of men in public life. Eminent in the pulpit and in church councils, he was not a theologian; he was not a great writer though he has ten volumes to his credit (in a final, collected edition). With a mind stored with interesting lore, prompt for utterance, he was not distinguished as a scholar. His son's just estimate is that an immense facility and the desultory aims of his brilliant cleverness prevented great accomplishments. Nevertheless, he was one of the most eminent men of his time, by virtue of a noble character and delightful temperament, by his religious feeling, and his untiring devotion to all philanthropies. Uncommonly, yet beautiful by interior grace, of a presence that reconciled the figure of a prophet of God with the social charm and cleverness of a man of the world, of inexhaustible capacity for the joy of home affections and of the beauty of nature, born for friendships and democratic kindness, he lived with fullness of life, doing good and inspiring good endeavor in fields near and far.

The biographer justly emphasizes the coincidence of Hale's spirit with the Maurice and Kingsley group in England and his conscious sympathy with them, though—while he viewed his ministerial task as that of building a new civilization—he had not their precise economic programme. He was not a man of programmes, and it was almost without design that he—not as founder but as inspirer—created the important development of Lend-a-Hand Societies, the Kings' Daughters, the Epworth League, and the Society for Christian Endeavor.

The historical student will find entertaining glimpses of Harvard classrooms and student life, letters that preserve the emotion and the atmosphere of life during the conflict with slavery, the Civil War, and the reconstruction period, and, in later days, the optimistic hopes of the American circles working for arbitration and a permanent Hague Tribunal; but Dr. Hale's relation to public affairs was not the close relation of an expert responsible for the creative process. His forte was that of the public advocate and the creator of the social disposition on which progress depends.

F. A. CHRISTIE.

Constitution Making in Indiana: a Source Book. In two volumes. By Charles Kettleborough, of the Indiana Bureau of Legislative Information. (Indianapolis, Indiana Historical Commission, 1916, pp. ccxli, 530; xv, 693.) These two volumes edited and annotated by Dr. Kettleborough were published by the Indiana Historical Commission as a part of the observance of the one-hundredth anniversary of the admission of Indiana into the Union. According to the preface, "the documents comprised in these two volumes are designed to illustrate and interpret the constitutional growth and development of the state of Indiana from the beginnings of its institutional history to the present. For the hundred years from 1816 to 1916, an attempt has been made to include every document of a constitutional character."

Not only are the documents included, but they are accompanied by illuminating notes and explanations throughout, and the summaries are impressively fortified by foot-notes and references. Dr. Kettleborough also has his own ideas in regard to what may be properly included in a state constitution. In speaking of the difficulties confronting the delegates to one of the constitutional conventions he remarks: "Aside from these alleged Machiavellian tactics of unscrupulous and calculating politicians, there were the zealous and misguided fanatics who hoped to incorporate their chauvinistic and half-baked political theories into the fundamental instrument of government."

The Indiana State Library is rich in newspaper files and these have been used by Dr. Kettleborough in an illuminating and discriminating way. Many of the newspapers, by the way, will not now feel flattered by the quotations from their columns. Some of them opposed almost every forward movement in the history of the state.

One of the most valuable parts of the work is an elaborate introduction by Dr. Kettleborough of 227 pages. This is a scholarly and accurate summary of the constitutional history of the state and presents a striking contrast to the many county histories which have been published in recent years for commercial purposes. This introduction should be reprinted in a separate volume for wider distribution.

The proposed "Marshall Constitution", the "Stotsenburg Amendments" and the efforts for a new constitution in 1916 are all adequately treated. The present constitution of Indiana was drafted in 1851 and is now out of date in many vital particulars. A new or revised document will without doubt be drafted in the near future. In this work the volumes of Dr. Kettleborough will be invaluable.

There is a useful appendix, and an elaborate index is included in each volume. On the whole these two volumes constitute an outstanding contribution to the constitutional history of Indiana. They will be received with gratitude by historical investigators.

THOMAS F. MORAN.

History of Economic Legislation in Iowa. By Ivan L. Pollock. [Iowa Economic History Series, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh.] (Iowa City, State Historical Society, 1918, pp. x, 386, \$2.00.) Of the body of state statutes which are clearly economic in character, a large proportion is included under the term commerce. In this category fall, first, the means of communication, as roads, railways, rivers and harbors, telegraphs and telephones; all these are important subjects of state legislation. Then are considered the agencies for the facilitation of trade, as money, banks, loan and trust companies, and various other business corporations and organizations. Besides, the insurance business is clearly economic in character and is one important subject for legislation.

Other lines of activity are on the border-land between matters classified as economic and those considered as social, ethical, or political. For instance, the care of the poor has important industrial relations, yet Mr. Pollock excludes this body of legislation. Education is also excluded, but in dealing with the activities of the state for the promotion of agriculture and other industries, the author makes it consist very largely in education. Labor legislation emanates from a variety of motives, but it is classified as predominantly economic, and a chapter is devoted to the subject. A chapter is also given to the subject of general taxation.

The titles of the thirteen chapters may serve to give a general idea of the book: 1, Transportation; 2, Railroad Transportation; 3, Agriculture and Stock-Raising; 4, Mines and Mining; 5, Conservation and Internal Improvement; 6, General Corporations; 7, Insurance; 8, Banking; 9, Building and Loan Associations; 10, Trade and Commerce; 11, Labor Legislation; 12, The Power of Municipal Corporations in enacting Economic Legislation; 13, Tax Legislation.

The author sticks quite closely to his text, which is a history of law-making, not law administration. Many of the statutes are, however, a mere dead letter, no attempt ever having been made to enforce them. There is here no systematic attempt to differentiate these from those which become operative in actual government. Iowa is put forward as a typical western state; there are, however, few references to the laws of other states. The chapters are occupied with brief chronological summaries of the laws on the various topics. Much of the text reads like an analytic table of contents to a fuller treatment of the subject. In fact, that is what it is. The pages are marred by no foot-notes, but following the text are forty-four pages devoted to references to the sources of information on the topics treated.

The chief merit of the book consists in the fact that in a very brief space the student is enabled to get a view of the general trend of a great body of legislation on a variety of topics, and at the same time is enabled to find the full text of the statute bearing upon topics of special interest.

In a book abounding in dates, it is inevitable that there should be errors, yet the only one noted is at the bottom of page 156, where 1866 should read 1886.

COMMUNICATION

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *American Historical Review*:

Sir:

WHEN Professor John Bassett Moore's review of my *President's Control of Foreign Relations* appeared in the July issue of the *Review* I had not time to give it attention. It is not, however, I trust, too late to correct through your pages some of the misleading impressions it seems likely to leave with the reader of it.

(1) Professor Moore thinks that the Senate report dealing with President Cleveland's appointment of Commissioner Blount was somewhat evasive and inconclusive as a vindication.

This is a matter of construction. It seems entirely reasonable to hold that the significance of this report consists precisely in its assimilating the case of Blount, notwithstanding the large powers conferred upon him, with that of previous "personal agents", and especially since a minority of the committee dissented on the point which Professor Moore says was evaded.

(2) On page 83 of my volume I write: "The downfall of Huerta was due directly to President Wilson's failure to recognize him as the *de facto* government of Mexico." Professor Moore comments: "Huerta did not claim recognition as 'the *de facto* government of Mexico', but as constitutional president."

Either this criticism is irrelevant or it implies that the administration did recognize Huerta as the *de facto* government of Mexico. In the latter connection President Wilson's words, in his address of December 2, 1913, to Congress are not open to misconstruction:

"There can be no certain prospect of peace in America until General Huerta has surrendered his usurped authority in Mexico ... Mexico has no government", etc. Nor did the administration later alter its attitude on this question.

(3) Professor Moore takes exception to my remark that "the power of Congress to declare war" appears "in actual exercise" to have been "the power to recognize an existing state of war", a power belonging also to the President "at least in the case of invasion or insurrection". He says: "A diminution of the power of Congress or an enlargement of that of the President, is not to be inferred from verbal jockeying for diplomatic advantage in the international game."

The observation is true enough, but not pertinent to a discussion which has for its subject the *form* which congressional "declarations of war" have taken from the outset (p. 140).

(4) Professor Moore criticizes a version of the Koszta episode which I quote from an opinion of the Supreme Court as "inaccurate and misleading". I do not find that it is in the least misleading regarding the topic in connection with which it is quoted. See, moreover, Rhodes, I. 416-418.

Most of the remaining criticisms are of much the same character, involving to a great extent matters of interpretation and opinion. It is of course difficult to bring an argued refutation of such criticisms within available space or within the rules governing communications of this character.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

HISTORICAL NEWS

Apologies are due for the late appearance of the October number. In these times promptness of publication is difficult, even though all precautions are taken. In this instance, the cause was an unaccountable delay of blue cover-paper in arriving at the printing office.

The annual list of doctoral dissertations in history in progress, which of late it has been customary to print in the January number of this journal, is, from motives of economy to the *Review*, omitted from the present issue; it will hereafter be printed in a pamphlet, by the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington, in an edition sufficient to supply all persons having any direct interest in the matter. Such persons, if they do not receive a copy before the beginning of February, may write to J. F. Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the Association, arranged to take place at Cleveland on December 27 and 28, has been indefinitely postponed on the advice of the health officer of that city, because of an epidemic of influenza prevalent there. The secretary has sent notice to all members. No announcement can now be made as to when this thirty-fourth annual meeting will be held.

The Winsor Prize essay, *Connecticut in Transition, 1775-1818*, by Dr. Richard J. Purcell, has been published, and distributed to subscribers. The *Annual Report* for 1917 is in galley-proof.

Now that the resort to London archives and libraries on the part of American historical students is likely to be resumed, perhaps on an increased scale, it is desirable to remind them of the existence of the London headquarters of the American Historical Association, a commodious room in the building of the Royal Historical Society at 22 Russell Square, in a locality convenient to both the Public Record Office and the British Museum. Here American students of history working in London may have opportunities of meeting, of keeping their papers in a safe place, and occasionally of obtaining guidance from the secretary of the London branch of the Association. They also receive advantages from the presence in the same building of the offices of the Royal Historical Society and of the Historical Association (of English teachers), and by the kindness of the former are given the privileges of its library.

These headquarters were acquired shortly before the war, have been little used during its continuance, but should henceforward be made a meeting-point of real importance to American scholarship. The London branch has a simple organization, with Lord Bryce as chairman, Mr. Hubert Hall vice-chairman, Mr. A. Percival Newton, of the University of London, secretary, and Mr. H. P. Biggar treasurer. The executive committee consists of these officers and of the three senior members (senior in college graduation) actually present in London or enrolled at the headquarters. A fee of 12 sh. is charged, which covers incidental expenses, the rent being paid by the American Historical Association.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR HISTORICAL SERVICE

With the ending of the war, it is to be expected that before long most operations of the Board, in its present form at least, will also come to an end. As certain functions which it has exercised deserve to be continued in time of peace, it is not unlikely that the American Historical Association, at the next opportunity, may be asked to provide some new organization for their continuance. Meantime, Professor Schafer, as vice-chairman, has been actively co-operating with Professor Aydelotte, director of instruction for the Students' Army Training Corps, in the preparation of helpful material for the conduct of those courses which relate to history and to the historical aspects of the problems of reconstruction. Aid has also been given by the Board to the new courses devised by the educational service of the Y. M. C. A. for the soldiers remaining in camps, in Europe and America. The large files of German newspapers, a score or more in number, which through the kindness of the British, French, and Belgian Missions the Board has been currently receiving, and which through an organization headed by Dr. Victor S. Clark have been made of use to the government in varied ways, will continue to be thus utilized until after the conclusion of peace.

Under the conviction that the war has on the one hand powerfully increased public interest in history and on the other hand made necessary a recasting of our system of history-teaching in schools, the Board has resolved, on invitation from the National Education Association, to make immediate efforts, with all possible energy, toward a solution of this problem. Professor Samuel B. Harding has been appointed chairman of a committee on the subject, and will be glad to receive suggestions, which should be addressed to him at the building of the Department of the Interior in Washington, room 5124.

PERSONAL

Andrew D. White, president of Cornell University from its foundation in 1867 till 1885, died at Ithaca on November 4, a few days before the completion of his eighty-sixth year. As one of the chief founders of the American Historical Association and its first president, 1884-1886,

he would be eminently entitled to grateful commemoration in these pages; but this was but a small part of the service he constantly rendered to history and to learning during a long lifetime. He was professor of history in the University of Michigan from 1857 to 1863, lectured often on historical subjects at Cornell, and collected a notable historical library, which he presented to the latter institution. His own chief historical work was *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896), a brilliant and learned series of studies in the history of civilization, always his favorite field. In 1910 he published a volume in the same general domain, that of the history of thought, of expansion of the human mind, of tolerance and intolerance, entitled *Seven Great Statesmen in the Warfare of Science with Unreason*. None of his books however is more profitable than his delightful *Autobiography* (1905), which may well be read by everyone who is occupied with history and higher education in America. The career which in that book he surveys with so much ripe wisdom and such genuine good-will toward all mankind had been one of great distinction, not only in education, but in legislative and diplomatic service, as senator in New York, minister to Germany and to Russia, and ambassador in Berlin; but the founding and early management of Cornell University was his most signal achievement, and Cornell and history remained his strongest interests. In history it was the development of ideas, of culture, and of learning that he most loved to emphasize. He influenced many young men toward their study; and, genial and kind as he was wise and experienced, he was the constant friend of them, and of all men.

Richard Schröder, who during the past fifty years had in succession held the chair of history of German law in the universities of Bonn, Würzburg, Strassburg, Göttingen, and Heidelberg, died at Heidelberg on January 3, 1918, aged seventy-nine years. At the time of his death he was preparing the sixth edition of his well-known *Lehrbuch der Deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* (first edition, 1889).

Mrs. Preston, formerly Mrs. Grover Cleveland, requests that any friends of Mr. Cleveland who possess published addresses or other critical comment of historical value concerning his policies or character, or letters to or from him, or personal recollections of incidents in connection with his life which would be of interest in the preparation of a biography, would communicate as soon as practicable with Mr. William Gorham Rice, 135 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York. Any such comment, letters, and memoranda will be acknowledged and will be carefully returned if the sender so desires. Whatever portions of the materials are left in Mr. Rice's hands will be deposited ultimately in the State Library at Albany. Mr. Rice was a secretary to Mr. Cleveland during his governorship, and was for many years thereafter associated with him, at Washington and elsewhere, as a valued friend.

Most of the work of the Committee on Public Information having now been brought to an end, Professor Guy S. Ford, who from May, 1917, to December, 1918, has constantly had charge of one of its most important divisions, and in that capacity has performed services of incalculable value toward the enlightenment of public opinion in war-time, returns at the beginning of the present month to his professorship and deanship in the University of Minnesota. Professor S. B. Harding, who has been closely associated with him in the work of the committee, remains in Washington, for important educational work under the Department of the Interior. Professors Carl Becker and George F. Zook return respectively to Cornell University and Pennsylvania State College.

Major (Professor) F. M. Fling has sailed to France with the group who accompanied President Wilson, to represent at Paris, during the period of the peace conference, the interests of the Historical Branch of the General Staff and to accumulate materials for that portion of its history of which he has charge, the portion relating to the diplomatic history of the war and the peace. Several other members of the historical profession—Professors Day, Haskins, Hornbeck, Kerner, Lord, Lunt, Lybyer, Seymour, Shotwell, Westermann, Dr. G. L. Beer—members of the organization of inquiry formed by Colonel House, have sailed in the same expedition.

Dr. Gaillard Hunt has been appointed by the State Department to write an official history of its activities during the period of the war; Professor James G. Randall has resigned as professor of history in Roanoke College and is serving as historian of the United States Shipping Board.

Professor U. B. Phillips, of the University of Michigan, who for more than a year has served as a Y. M. C. A. official in Camp Gordon, is now serving in the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department; Captain A. L. P. Dennis of that division has been ordered to London, to serve as military attaché in connection with the American embassy there.

Professor D. C. Shilling of Monmouth College, on leave of absence from that institution, has been engaged in Y. M. C. A. work at Camp Sherman and more recently as general secretary of the Students' Army Training group at Miami University.

Mrs. Lois K. Mathews, of the University of Wisconsin, has by marriage become Mrs. Marvin B. Rosenberry, but continues under that name her functions as assistant professor of history.

Dr. Charles H. Cunningham, of the University of Texas, has been given a year's leave of absence and has gone to Mexico. Professor Charles W. Hackett, formerly of the University of New Mexico, has temporarily taken his place.

Leroy F. Jackson, professor of American history in the State College of Washington, is on leave for the year to take charge of the educational work of the Y. M. C. A. for the Spruce Division. Professor Frank A. Golder, of the same institution, returns to his work there after several months' service to Colonel House's Inquiry.

GENERAL

All historical students, it is believed, will welcome the news that the decisive steps have at last been taken in the matter of a National Archive Building in Washington. The *ex officio* commission designated for the purpose by the Public Buildings Act of 1913 has approved the site selected by the Secretary of the Treasury (and previously by the Public Buildings Commission of 1917) and the land is being bought. The plans made in 1915, and which met with widespread approval, are being adapted to the site chosen. Existing legislation already authorizes the erection of the building, and it is hoped with some confidence that appropriations for beginning work will be made by Congress during the present session.

Mention was made in our October number of the "War Issues Courses", partly historical, which were then being begun in most American colleges under novel agreements with the War Department for the Students' Army Training Corps. With the cessation of warfare, these contracts are being dissolved, but the "War Issues Courses" are in most cases voluntarily continued by the colleges. As a part of the needful material, Professor Frank Aydelotte, who has general superintendence of the courses, is planning for a series of pamphlets, on international relations and on problems of reconstruction, to be published by the World Peace Foundation. Among those listed for early issue is one on Great Britain, America, and Democracy, by Professor E. D. Adams, and one on Japan and the United States, by Professor P. J. Treat.

The attention of young students of history should be called to the establishment in Oxford of the degree of doctor of philosophy upon terms resembling those usual in the United States, and presenting much greater advantages and opportunity than heretofore to those American students who wish to study with Oxford professors without sacrificing anything essential in the programme they have marked out for their academic curricula in the United States. Mutual recognition, by American universities of work done at Oxford and by Oxford of work done in American universities, toward the doctorate, being now established, it is to be hoped that migration of scholars may much increase. Details concerning the new doctorate at Oxford may be found in the *American Oxonian* for April last.

The Division of Economics and History in the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace is planning to add to its studies of the economic

history of the war, previously mentioned in these pages, a Japanese series of studies based on the historical investigation of various aspects of finance and economics as affected by war and armament in the Far East. Books on the history of the American peace movement, on the history of the causes of war, and on the effects of the late European war on the industry, commerce, and finance of South American countries are nearly ready for publication. The Division of International Law has under preparation a monograph on the history of plebiscites, by Miss Sarah Wambaugh; a revised edition of Madison's *Notes of 1787*, edited by Dr. Gaillard Hunt; further volumes of the *Classics of International Law* (Wolff, Pufendorf, and Alberico Gentili); and a pamphlet on the Declaration of London, February 26, 1909 (text and comment). The Endowment is also providing for fuller historical exposition of the rights of belligerents and neutrals at sea, by aiding the publication of a collection of English classics on those rights, and a documentary history of events relating to them during the French wars, 1793-1815, both to be edited by Sir Francis Piggott, chief justice of Hong Kong and formerly legal adviser to the prime minister of Japan.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has begun the publication of a most useful little series of pamphlets, of forty or fifty pages apiece, entitled *Helps for the Students of History*, edited by Mr. Charles Johnson of the Public Record Office and Professor J. P. Whitney of King's College. Four of these sixpenny pamphlets have already come out: an excellent little account of the Episcopal Registers of England and Wales, by Mr. R. C. Fowler; of (English) Municipal Records, by Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw; of Medieval Reckonings of Time, by Dr. R. L. Poole; and of the Public Record Office, by Mr. Charles Johnson—the latter, however, taking little account of anything not medieval. Later papers will treat of such topics as the care of documents, the logic of history, the French Renaissance, and the manuscripts in the Public Record Office of Dublin and at Trinity College.

The articles of chief interest in the October number of the *Historical Outlook* are: a comprehensive analysis of the French government, by Professor Othon Guerlac, member of the French High Commission; the Deeper Roots of Pan-Germanism, by Professor J. W. Thompson; the Trade Routes of Western Asia, by Professor W. L. Westermann; How Southerners supported the War for Secession, by Professor J. S. Bassett; and a group of Documents relating to the Future of the British Empire, arranged by Professor A. L. Cross. Those in the November number are: the Repulsiveness of the German State, by Professor G. H. Mead; Further Evidence in the Case against Germany, by Professor L. M. Larson; Germany's Grip on Public Opinion, by Lieut. W. A. Chamberlin; English Background of American Institutions, by Professor G. B. Adams; Evolution of Democracy in England, by Professor Conyers

Read; Beginnings in Political Education, by Professor Edgar Dawson; American Catholics and the War, by Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday; Effects of the War on Labor and Capital, by Professor E. L. Bogart; and an article, by Theodore C. Blegen, entitled Two Standards of Morality (American and German). The December number opens with interesting Impressions of Britain in War-Time, by Professor A. C. McLaughlin; the other chief historical articles are, one on the Railroads of the United States and the War, by Professor T. W. Van Metre, and one on the New Birth of Islam, by Professor A. T. Olmstead.

History for October contains articles on the Origins of France, by Professor F. M. Powicke, on an Italian Historian (Villari), by Dr. H. M. Beatty, and on the Teaching of History in South African Schools, by Mr. A. F. Hattersley.

Volume IV., number 1, of *Smith College Studies in History* (64 pp.) presents an analysis of the Problem of Administrative Areas, by Mr. Harold J. Laski of Harvard University, in which the possibilities of federalism and the relations of social and industrial to political organization, especially in Great Britain, are thoughtfully considered, and set forth with much acuteness.

America and Britain: the Story of the Relations between the two Peoples, a brief book by H. H. Powers, is published by Macmillan.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. R. Thayer, *History—Quick or Dead?* (*Atlantic Monthly*, November); I. A. Loos, *Historical Approach to Economics* (*American Economic Review*, September); J. H. Rosny aîné, *L'Évolution des Conflits Ethniques et Sociaux* (*Mercur de France*, July 16).

ANCIENT HISTORY

The *Inscriptions Hiéroglyphiques du Musée National de Copenhague* (Copenhagen, Hoest, 1918, pp. 148, plates 29) have been published by Maria Mogensen.

The Schweich Lectures for 1916 were given by Professor L. W. King, of the University of London, assistant keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities in the British Museum. They are now published, for the British Academy, by Humphrey Milford, in a volume entitled *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in relation to Hebrew Tradition*.

Of the volumes of *Oriental Studies* issued by the Yale University Press, the most recent that relate to ancient history are a volume of *Miscellaneous Sumerian Religious Texts*, edited by Professor G. A. Barton of Bryn Mawr, three volumes of *Documents from the Temple Archives of Tellah*, containing the texts of 400 business documents of the period of the dynasty of Ur, edited by the same scholar, and the first of a series of volumes of *Letters and Contracts from Erecch*, Neo-Babylonian, edited by Dr. C. E. Keiser.

The *Loeb Classical Library* has issued the first of five volumes of a translation of Pausanias, by W. H. S. Jones.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Seymour de Ricci, *Esquisse d'une Bibliographie Égyptologique*, II. (*Revue Archéologique*, November, 1917); L. Pareti, *Pelasgica* (*Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, April); A. Gwynn, *The Character of Greek Colonization* (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. XXXVIII.); G. Batault, *L'Idée de Progrès et la Guerre d'après Xénophon, Stratège Athénien* (*Mercure de France*, October 1); P. Corssen, *Das Angebliche Werk des Olynthiers Kallisthenes über Alexander den Grossen* (*Philologus*, LXXIV. 1); K. Hartmann, *Ueber das Verhältnis des Cassius Dio zur Parthergeschichte des Flavius Arrianus* (*ibid.*); J. Wells, *Cicero and the Conquest of Gaul* (*Quarterly Review*, October); T. Frank, *The Economic Life of an Ancient City* (*Classical Philology*, June); J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des Griechisch-Römischen Heidentums* (*Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, XLI. 3).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

R. Knopf has completed and published the second part of the late J. Weiss's *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1918).

An extended study of *Das Register Gregors I., Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Päpstlichen Kanzlei- und Registerwesens bis auf Gregor VII.* (Freiburg, Herder, 1918) is by Peitz.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has published a version, the first into English, of *The Lausiaca History of Palladius*, translated from Abbot Butler's text.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Batiffol, *Augustin, Pélage, et le Siège Apostolique, 411-417* (*Revue Biblique*, January); P. A. Vaccari, *Gli Ultimi Anni di S. Girolamo* (*Civiltà Cattolica*, August 17).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Mr. Poultney Bigelow's *Genseric, King of the Vandals and First Prussian Kaiser* (Putnam, 1918, pp. xix, 207) is, as might be inferred from the name, no unimpassioned product of scholarship, but a *tendenziös* historical narrative filled with modern comparisons, set forth acutely and with great warmth of feeling.

Ernst Mayer's *Geschworenengericht und Inquisitionsprozess* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1916, pp. 379) contributes much to the discussion of the origins of the jury and allied problems, and has called forth various critical and controversial reviews.

The Yale University Press has in the printer's hands an edition, by Professor Charles C. Torrey, of the Arabic text of the *Futuh-Misir* of Ibn 'Abd al-Hakam, the oldest known history of the Mohammedan con-

quest of Egypt, North Africa, and Spain, written in the ninth century A. D., and now edited from the manuscripts in London, Paris, and Leyden.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Dvorak, *Idealismus und Naturalismus in der Gotischen Skulptur und Malerei* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIX. 1); J. W. Thompson, *Dutch and Flemish Colonization in Medieval Germany* (American Journal of Sociology, September); M. de Wulf, *Western Philosophy and Theology in the Thirteenth Century* (Harvard Theological Review, October).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

M. Édouard Driault's *Tilsit: France et Russie sous le Premier Empire* (Paris, Alcan) continues his existing series of valuable works upon the foreign policy of Napoleon, by a volume of first-rate importance.

In an important volume entitled *Le Secret de la Frontière, 1815-1871-1914: Charleroi* (Paris, Bossard, 1918, pp. 600), M. Fernand Engerand sets forth the processes by which France, through the treaties of 1815 and 1871, was subjected to great military disadvantages, which proved to be almost fatal in 1914.

The Dublin Review for October prints a group of letters written, 1829-1840, by Cardinal Wiseman, founder of that journal, to Archbishop Whitfield of Baltimore, throwing new light on historical episodes such as the conclave of 1831.

The little collection of documents under the title *La Protestation du Luxembourg, 1831-1839, c'est malgré lui que le Luxembourg a été livré à l'Influence Allemande* (Macon, Protat, 1918, pp. 44) elucidates certain phases of the tangled international problem of this small but strategic area in the nineteenth century.

André David's investigations of *Les Plébiscites et les Cessions de Territoires* (Paris, Rousseau, 1918, pp. 123) are of timely interest in connection with certain problems of the peace negotiations.

The publication of secret diplomatic documents by the Bolshevik government in Russia has led the French Foreign Office to publish a Yellow Book containing *Documents Diplomatiques, l'Alliance Franco-Russe, Origine de l'Alliance, 1890-1893, Convention Militaire, 1892-1899, et Convention Navale, 1912* (Paris, Imp. Nationale, 1918, pp. x, 139). For the first time the subject of the Dual Alliance has become a matter not of surmise and speculation but of historic certainty.

Louis Férasson explains the important but little understood subject of *La Question du Fer, le Problème Franco-Allemand du Fer* (Paris, Payot, 1918); J. Flach traces *Les Affinités Françaises de l'Alsace avant Louis XIV. et l'Iniquité de sa Séparation de la France* (Paris, Tenin, 1915, pp. 158); the wishes of the people are revealed in a collection of

documents and addresses entitled *L'Alsace et la Lorraine doivent rester Françaises* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1918); and the nature of the German propaganda on the subject is exposed in *La Question d'Alsace-Lorraine; la Propagande Allemande depuis la Guerre et les Faits* (ibid., pp. 117) by V. H. Friedel.

The Committee on Public Information has published, in a quarto pamphlet of 30 pages, *The German-Bolshevik Conspiracy*, the series of documents secured in Russia nearly a year ago by its agent, Mr. Edgar Sisson, and published in the September newspapers. The series, which exhibits the close relations between the Bolshevik government and the Petrograd branch of the German General Staff, is now illustrated by some seventeen facsimiles and accompanied by a report on their genuineness (affirming it so far as the main Russian series is concerned), prepared by a committee of investigation appointed, at Mr. Creel's request, by the National Board for Historical Service.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. d'Avenel, *Le Transport des Marchandises depuis Sept Siècles* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1); Father B. Kruitwagen, *De Uitvinding van de Boekdrukkunst en hare eerste Voortbrengselen* (Handelingen van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden, 1917-1918, pp. 17-52); A. Eekhof, *Hoe heeft Calvijn over Luther gedacht?* (Nederlandsche Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, n. s. XIV.); R. Peyre, *Coup d'Oeil sur la Question d'Orient en France au XVII^e Siècle* (Revue des Études Historiques, April); G. M. Trevelyan, *The Four Great Wars* (Edinburgh Review, October); C. Oman, *The Irish Troops in the Service of Spain, 1709-1818* (Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, February, May, August); W. M. Sloane, *Napoleon and Hohenzollern* (The Nation, November 2); E. Laloy, *Le Livre Jaune sur l'Alliance Franco-Russe* (Mercure de France, September 16).

THE GREAT WAR

The Department of Public Instruction of the State of Michigan has published, as *Bulletin* no. 20, *Democracy and the Great War* (pp. 234), by Dr. George N. Fuller, secretary of the Michigan Historical Commission, in which a very successful attempt is made to set forth in outline the factors entering into the history of the recent struggle.

Among the publications of documents concerning France's part in the war are the *Recueil des Documents insérés au Bulletin Officiel du Ministre de la Guerre et concernant spécialement la Période des Hostilités* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1918) which extends to 5300 pages bound in six volumes and a supplement for the period to the end of December, 1917.

The fourth supplement of *Proclamations, Orders in Council, and Documents relating to the European War* has been published by the

département of the Secretary of State of Canada, and brings this valuable compilation down to October 1, 1916.

The University of Chicago Press has issued *Readings in the Economics of the War*, edited by J. Maurice Clark, Walton H. Hamilton, and Harold G. Moulton (pp. 676).

In *The German War Code* (University of Illinois *Bulletin*, vol. XV., no. 49), Professor James W. Garner makes a comparison of the German manual of the laws of war with those of the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Hague Convention.

A new German White Book made-up of documents relative to the origin of the war will before long be issued, in three or four volumes, edited by Karl Kautsky, the Socialist party leader, now under-secretary for foreign affairs.

The Cradle of the War (Little, Brown, pp. 360), by Henry C. Woods, dealing with the Near East and Pan-Germanism, is based upon the author's notes for his course of lectures upon War and Diplomacy in the Balkans, delivered before the Lowell Institute, 1917-1918.

An account of *Le Complot de Sarajévo, 28 Juin 1914* (Paris, Boscard, 1918) has been written by J. Chopin, and a second volume of *Responsabilités et Buts de Guerre* (Paris, Figuière, 1918) has come from the pen of C. Daniélou. An anonymous volume deals with *Le Mensonge Autrichien, l'Incident Clemenceau-Czernin* (*ibid.*).

The American Association for International Conciliation has published the *Memoranda and Letters of Dr. Mühlton*, giving, in German text, matter reprinted from the *Berliner Tageblatt* (March 21, 1918), and *Die Freie Zeitung* (March 27-May 4, 1918), and on opposite pages a translation by Professor Munroe Smith; translations have also been published by the George H. Doran Company in a pamphlet entitled *Revelations by an Ex-Director of Krupp's*. (See also p. 294, above.)

French views of Germans and German policies and methods are further expounded in *Les Allemands de Toujours* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1917, pp. xi, 316) by A. Aderer; in *L'Allemagne Secrète* (Paris, Michel, 1918); and in *L'Allemagne et la Paix* (Paris, Delagrave, 1918) by Professor E. Denis. Professor H. Lichtenberger and others have collected two volumes of lectures on *Les Appétits Allemands* (Paris, Alcan, 1918), with sub-titles *Les Ambitions de l'Allemagne* and *Les Rêves d'Hégémonie Mondiale*.

In the *Historische Zeitschrift* (CXIX. 1, pp. 169-170) will be found a list of some of the keenest German articles directed against English imperialism during the war. England's position in Egypt and in India furnishes material for two particular lines of attack.

A realistic account of the heroic resistance offered by General French's army in the retreat from Mons to the Marne is given in *The Black Watch* (Doubleday, Page, pp. 255), by Scout Joe Cassells, one of the survivors.

René Puaux has produced a biographical sketch of *Foch, sa Vie, sa Doctrine, son Oeuvre, la Foi en la Victoire* (Paris, Payot, 1918), and P. Bonnefon, of *Le Premier "As", Pégoud* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918).

New issues of the notable series of *Mémoires et Récits de Guerre* (Paris, Hachette, 1918) are Commandant J. E. Hennes, *À l'École de la Guerre, Lettres d'un Artilleur, Août 1914-Octobre 1916*; and L. Hourticq, *Récits et Réflexions d'un Combattant, Aisne, Champagne, Verdun, 1915-1917*. Other recently issued French memoirs of the war are V. Magne, *Heures de Guerre, d'Afrique en Flandre et en Campagne* (Paris, Perrin, 1918); H. Libermann, *L'Infanterie Héroïque et Douloureuse, Thiaumont-Moronvilliers, Juillet-Août 1916-Mars-Avril 1917, Récits Vécus d'un Officier de Ligne* (*ibid.*); M. Buteau, *Tenir* (Paris, Plon, 1918); M. Dupont, *En Campagne, l'Attente, Impressions d'un Officier de Légère, 1915-1916-1917* (*ibid.*); J. L. G. Pastre, *Trois Ans de Front, Belgique, Aisne et Champagne, Verdun, Argonne, Lorraine, Notes et Impressions d'un Artilleur* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918); Capitaine Delvert, *Histoire d'une Compagnie, Main de Massiges, Verdun, Novembre 1915-Juin 1916, Journal de Marche* (*ibid.*).

Fighting the Boche Underground (Scribner, pp. 234), by Capt. H. D. Trounce, gives a vivid account of mining and sapping, describing the construction of galleries and mines, and the explosions about Neuville, St. Vaast, in Flanders, near Arras, and under Vimy Ridge.

In *L'Heure de l'Italie, Voyage de Guerre, 1916* (Paris, Bossard, 1917) J. Ajalbert has recorded observations on how Italy has faced the conditions of the war. A brief statement of Portugal's participation is made by P. Osorio in the pamphlet *Le Portugal et la Guerre* (Paris, Payot, 1918). Of more considerable proportions is *Le Nationalisme Suédois et la Guerre* (Paris, Perrin, 1918) by L. Maury.

An unusually entertaining and informing account of the Salonica campaign is to be found in *Macedonian Musings* (Allen and Unwin, pp. 188), by V. J. Seligman, an officer in the Army Service Corps.

Military operations in the Caucasus, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Palestine are described and discussed by C. Stiénon in *Les Campagnes d'Orient* (Paris, Payot, 1918); and *L'Occupation Austro-Bulgare en Serbie* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918, pp. 164) is described by Novakovitch.

The War in the Cradle of the World (Harper, pp. 371) describes the experiences of Eleanor F. Egan in the war zone of Mesopotamia.

The Secret of the Navy (London, Murray, pp. 333), by Bennet Copplestone, is made up for the most part of articles reprinted from the *Cornhill Magazine*, treating of British naval operations.

The Zeebrugge Affair (Doran, pp. 64), by Keble Howard (J. Keble Bell), gives a vivid account of the operations at Zeebrugge and Ostend, with the official narratives of those events.

In *Fishermen in War Time* (London and Edinburgh, Sampson Low, Marston, and Co., pp. 240), Walker Wood tells of the part played by the North Sea fishermen during more than three years of war.

In *A Captive on a German Raider* (McBride, pp. 151), F. G. Trayes tells of the capture by the *Wolf* of the Japanese vessel *Hitachi Maru* on which he was a passenger, and of the Spanish steamer, *Igotz Mendi*, and of his experiences as a prisoner aboard these three vessels.

The activities of the French navy are recorded in *Sur nos Fronts de Mer* (Paris, Plon, 1918, pp. 323) by Commandant E. Vedel; *Sur le Front de Mer, le Mémorial de la Marine Marchande* (Paris, Renouard, 1918, pp. xii, 220) by A. Galopin; *80,000 Milles en Torpilleur, Récits de Chasse aux Sous-marins, 1914-1916* (Paris, Perrin, 1918, pp. 302) by J. Fierre; *Dix-neuf Histoires de Sous-marins* (Paris, Payot, 1918) by B. Frank; and *Vingt Mois de Guerre à Bord du Croiseur "Jeanne-d'Arc", 9 Août 1914-12 Avril 1916* (Paris, Perrin, 1918, pp. viii, 286).

Among the most interesting novelties of the war literature are the memoirs of the aviators, of which recent publications are C. Delacommune, *L'Escadrille des Éperviers, Impressions Vécus de Guerre Aérienne* (Paris, Plon, 1918); Lieutenant Marc, *Notes d'un Pilote Disparu, 1916-1917* (Paris, Hachette, 1918); B. Lafont, *Au Ciel de Verdun, Notes d'un Aviateur* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918, pp. xii, 202); and J. Mortane and J. Daçay, *La Guerre des Nues racontée par ses Morts* (Paris, Édition Française Illustrée, 1918).

S. Grumbach, author of the well-known book on *Das Annexionistische Deutschland*, has a volume on *Brest-Litovsk* (Lausanne, Payot).

Summaries of the peace treaties made by the Central Powers with Russia, Ukraina, Finland, and Rumania may be found in the *American Political Science Review* for November, pp. 706-715. Their complete texts seem not to have been published otherwise than in European newspapers, but translations of the essential parts are in no. 128 of *International Conciliation*, and the treaties with Russia and Finland are in *Current History* for April and June.

Messrs. C. D. Snow and J. J. Kral of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce have prepared for the Department of Commerce, and issued as Miscellaneous Series, no. 65, of their bureau, a monograph

entitled *German Trade and the War* (pp. 236), which is in large part a history of German economic life in war-time, with information on administration, organization, manufacture, transportation, and labor conditions.

Dr. Daniel J. McCarthy, who inspected a large number of the German prison camps on behalf of the American embassy, in 1916, has prepared a temperate general account of the whole system in *The Prisoner of War in Germany: the Care and Treatment of the Prisoner of War, with a History of the Development of the Principle of Neutral Inspection and Control* (London, Skeffington). A special aspect of the system, revealing some of its worst features, is set forth in *Dans les Camps de Re-présailles* (Paris, Hachette), by Jean-Jules Dufour, an artist who was one of 2000 Frenchmen selected for imprisonment and hard labor in the unhealthy swamps of Soltau, in reprisal for the detention in Dahomey of Germans captured in the Cameroons. The French government has published the *Rapports des Délégués du Gouvernement Espagnol sur leurs Visites dans les Camps de Prisonniers Français en Allemagne, 1914-1917* (Paris, Hachette, 1918). G. Arvengas has related his experiences *Entre les Fils de Fer, Carnet d'un Prisonnier de Guerre, 1914-1917* (Paris, Jouve, 1918, pp. 252). In *Kultured Kaptivity* (Bobbs Merrill, pp. 244) records the prison experiences of Ivan Rossiter, of the Canadian Mounted Rifles, who was captured at Sanctuary Wood.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Madelin, *Les Batailles de l'Aisne*, I.-II. (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 1, 15); G. Hanotaux, *La Bataille de Guise-Saint-Quentin*, 28-30 Août 1914 (*ibid.*, September 1, 15); R. Maurice, *L'Évolution des Méthodes d'Offensive de 1915 à 1918* (*Mercure de France*, September 16, October 16); J. Reinach, *Le Dégagement de Verdun* (*Revue des Sciences Politiques*, June 15); A. Fribourg, *Les Paysans d'Alsace-Lorraine devant les Conseils de Guerre Allemands* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, September 1); J. Chopin, *Les Yougoslaves et l'Entente* (*Mercure de France*, October 1); C. Spellanzon, *La Guerre Européenne dans les Balkans* (*Revue des Nations Latines*, July 16); *id.*, *Les Balkans et la Guerre Européenne* (*ibid.*, August 1); *id.*, *La Politique Internationale: l'Expédition de Salonique* (*ibid.*, September 1); *id.*, *La Politique Internationale: la Roumanie et la Guerre Européenne* (*ibid.*, September 16); Maj. T. E. Compton, *The Rumanian Campaign, 1916-17* (*Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, August); A. Gérard, *Le Front d'Asie et la Tâche des Alliés* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15); R. Pichon, *Une Nouvelle Anabase, la Campagne des Tchéco-Slovaques en Sibérie* (*ibid.*, September 1); R. La Bruyère, *L'Échec de la Guerre Sous-Marine*, I. (*ibid.*, October 1); Contre-Amiral Degouy, *Sur la Côte Mourmane* (*ibid.*, August 15).

(See also pp. 336, 337.)

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

In its sixpenny series of *Texts for Students*, as no. 5, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has published *A Translation of the Latin Writings of St. Patrick*, by Canon Newport White, professor in the University of Dublin. No. 4 was the Latin texts of the same; no. 3 a body of *Selections from Giraldus Cambrensis* (pp. 64); no. 2, of *Selections from Matthew Paris* (pp. 64). The same society has also just published a third and revised edition of *Roman Roads in Britain*, by Thomas Codrington, member of the Institute of Civil Engineers.

The Great Roll of the Pipe for 26 Henry III., 1241-1242, edited by Professor Henry L. Cannon of Stanford University, is announced for publication by the Yale University Press.

A. M. Samuel has written a volume on the curious and interesting subject of *The Herring, its Effect on the History of Britain* (London, Murray, 1918, pp. xx, 199). The study is brought down to the twentieth century and is accompanied by a bibliography.

The latest issued among the *Cambridge Historical Essays* is a volume on *The Navy of the Restoration from the Death of Cromwell to the Treaty of Breda: its Work, Growth, and Influence*, by Arthur W. Tedder of Magdalene College.

Lieut.-Gen. Sir Edward Hutton's *Brief History of the King's Royal Rifle Corps, 1755 to 1915* (Winchester, Warren and Son, 1917, pp. 84) gives a summary of all its campaigns and achievements from the time when it was raised in North America just after Braddock's defeat till after the completion of rather more than a year of the recent war. Naturally that conflict and the Boer War preceding occupy the major portion of its space, but episodes in our French and Indian War, in the Peninsular War, in the Red River Expedition of 1870, in Egypt, and in India have also their place, all being treated with laudable care and restraint.

Two volumes of *Selected Speeches and Documents on British Colonial Policy, 1763-1917* (London, Humphrey Milford), edited by Mr. A. B. Keith, in the *World's Classics* series, are intended to exhibit the extension of the system of responsible government, and other aspects of the development of the British Empire.

The French Revolution in English History, studied in various aspects, of event and of thought, is the work of Philip Anthony Brown, a young English scholar killed at the battle-front in November, 1915, before he had effected the complete revision of his book. Edited by Mr. J. L. Hammond, it has been published by Crosby Lockwood.

No. 8 of the *University of Chicago War Papers* is *Democracy and Social Progress in England*, by Miss Edith Abbott, lecturer in sociology at the University.

Much interesting matter concerning military and Egyptian history is to be found in Dr. Stanley Lane Poole's *Watson Pasha* (London, Murray), a memoir of Colonel Sir Charles Moore Watson, K. C. M. G.

In the *Scottish Historical Review* for October the first article, by Dr. George Neilson, entitled "Brus vs. Balliol, 1291-1292: the Model for Edward I.'s Tribunal", endeavors to connect that court with the *centumviri* of the Roman jurisprudence; Mr. J. Storer Clouston, under the title, "Two Features of the Orkney Earldom," discourses of the constant dividing of their realm by the Norse jarls and of their goethings, or vassal nobility; Miss Aubrey Cunningham, of the Revolution Government in the Highlands; Mr. R. K. Hannay of the General Register House, Edinburgh, of the feuing of the Church lands at the Reformation.

Upon the basis of the standard *History of Dumbartonshire*, by Mr. Joseph Irving, published in 1859, his son, John Irving, has brought out, as part I. of a revised history of the county, *Dumbarton Castle: its Place in the General History of Scotland* (Dumbarton, Bennett and Thomson, pp. viii, 147).

Louis Tréguiz has furnished a comprehensive account of *L'Irlande dans la Crise Universelle*, 3 Août 1914-21 Juillet 1917 (Paris, Alcan, 1918), including such topics as Home Rule and the war; the Sinn Féin; the rebellion of 1916; and the constitutional efforts.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. M. Stenton, *The Supremacy of the Mercian Kings* (*English Historical Review*, October); J. H. Round, "Barons" and "Peers" (*ibid.*); Capt. C. S. Goldingham, *The Navy under Henry VII.* (*ibid.*); W. Jenkinson, *London Colleges, Hospitals, and Schools in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Literature* (*Church Quarterly Review*, October).

FRANCE

The John Crerar Library has published *A Catalogue of French Economic Documents from the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries* (Chicago, 1918, pp. viii, 104) for a collection of acts, ordinances, documents, and pamphlets which it acquired from a Leipzig bookseller in 1904. The collection contains 1471 pieces, arranged as in the list, and bound in twenty-five volumes. It is surmised that the collection was formed by a French official who emigrated at the outbreak of the Revolution. The publication of the catalogue places this rich collection at the command of investigators throughout the country.

Paul Piazza has presented to the Paris faculty of law as his doctoral thesis an *Étude Historique et Critique sur l'Organisation et la Fonctionnement des Tribunaux de Commerce en France* (Paris, Rousseau, 1918, pp. vii, 496).

Some interesting studies in the development of French national character have recently appeared. René Lote has written of *Les Intellectuels dans la Société Française, de l'Ancien Régime à la Démocratie, Ouvrage suivi d'une Étude sur Félix Le Dantec* (Paris, Alcan, 1918, pp. vi, 215); and E. Levy, of *La Révélation Française, Essai sur le Génie de la France Nouvelle* (Paris, Perrin, 1918).

Gontier Col (?1354-?1418) was a secretary and diplomatic agent of Charles VI. and somewhat of a figure in the history of the preliminary renaissance of his period. In a series of articles in the *Romanic Review*, now gathered together in a pamphlet or volume entitled *Gontier Col and the French Pre-Renaissance* (pp. 103), Miss Alma Le Duc, instructor in Barnard College, has amply stated all that is known of his official and his literary career.

No. 4 of vol. XXXVI. of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies* is an historical dissertation on *French Protestantism, 1559-1562* (pp. viii, 185) by Caleb G. Kelly.

A very interesting and very important chapter in the history of applied science is treated with great learning and lucidity in a work recently *couronné* by the French Academy of Science, *Histoire de la Longitude à la Mer, au XVIII^e Siècle, en France* (Paris, Challamel, 1917, pp. xii, 332), by Lieutenant-de-vaisseau Marguet.

G. Bourgin has prepared *Les Papiers des Assemblées de la Révolution aux Archives Nationales, Inventaire de la Sous-Série F¹⁰* (Paris, Société de l'Histoire de la Révolution Française, 1918, pp. xxv, 358). The Abbé J. Charonnot is the author of an extensive study of *Mgr. de la Luzerne et les Serments pendant la Révolution* (Paris, Picard, 1918, pp. xv, 536).

The former editor of the *Figaro*, A. Périer, is the author of a volume on *Napoléon Journaliste* (Paris, Plon, 1918, pp. iii, 434) which is rather disappointing in its failure to handle facts with care, accuracy, and critical insight. B. Aletrino has written *Napoleons Laatste Levensjaren* (Amsterdam, van Holkema, 1916, pp. 366). A recent addition to the list of Napoleonic military memoirs is the *Souvenirs du Major Le Roy, 1767-1851* (Dijon, Berthier, 1914, pp. x, 326), edited by G. Dumay.

Les Précurseurs, Histoire de la Révolution de 1848 (Paris, Delagrave, 1918, pp. 450), by G. Bouniols, is not so much an account of events as an attempt to trace the origin of certain current social and political movements and tendencies.

Attempts to describe and analyze the conditions in France during the progress of the war have been made by A. Albert-Petit in *La France de la Guerre* (vol. I., Paris, Bossard, 1918); by G. Alphaud in *La France pendant la Guerre, 1914-1918* (vol. II., Paris, Hachette, 1918); by Marc Helys in *Les Provinces Françaises pendant la Guerre* (Paris,

Perrin, 1918); and by F. Tardif, *Un Département pendant la Guerre* (La Roche-sur-Yon, Vendée, Guigné-Hurtaud, 1917, pp. 285). More purely descriptive and narrative are Cunisset-Carnot, *La Vie aux Champs pendant la Guerre* (Paris, Flammarion, 1917); H. Galli, *La Guerre à Paris* (Paris, Garnier, 1917, pp. 458); A. Fage, *Lille sous la Griffe Allemande* (Paris, Perrin, 1918); and E. Basly, *Le Martyre de Lens, Trois Années de Captivité* (Paris, Plon, 1918).

Le Livre ou Cartulaire de la Nation de Normandie de l'Université de Paris (Rouen, Lainé, 1918, pp. 108) has been edited by H. Omont, and Dr. G. Panel has edited for the Société de l'Histoire de Normandie the first volume (1224-1630) of *Documents concernant les Pauvres de Rouen, Extraits des Archives de l'Hotel de Ville* (Paris, Picard, 1917, pp. xlix, 257).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Mathorez, *Les Éléments de Population Orientale en France: les Russes en France du XI^e au XVIII^e Siècle* (Revue des Études Historiques, July); K. Glaser, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Politischen Literatur, Frankreichs in der Zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, III. (Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur, XLV. 1); Paul Van Dyke, *Les Prétendus Mémoires de Jeanne d'Albret* (Revue Historique, September-October); Frank Puaux, *Origines, Causes et Conséquences de la Guerre des Camisards* (ibid., September-October); id., *Les Mémoires de Cavalier sur la Guerre des Cévennes* (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, January); E. Durkheim, "Le Contrat Social de Rousseau": *Histoire du Livre*, I. (Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale, January); M. Marion, *La Question du Papier-Monnaie en 1790: les Premières Fautes* (Revue Historique, September-October); L. Dubreuil, *L'Idée Régionaliste sous la Révolution*, IV. *Les Municipalités des Villes et des Campagnes avant 1798* (Annales Révolutionnaires, July); A. Mathiez, *Les Notes de Robespierre contre les Dantonistes: Essai d'Édition Critique* (ibid.).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

Two volumes have appeared of a new history of *Il Risorgimento Italiano* (Florence, Sansoni, 1918) by Masi.

Several authors have collaborated in the writing of *L'Ultima Dominazione Austriaca e la Liberazione del Veneto nel 1866* (Chioggia, Vianelli, 1916, pp. 430).

The modern history of Italian legislation can be followed by means of Signori A. Capozio and U. Maculan's *Indice Sistematico Cronologico della Legislazione Italiana, 1861-1917* (Rome, Bertero, pp. 455, xxxiv).

The Harvard University Press announces for early publication *The Mesta: a Study in Spanish Economic History*, by Dr. Julius Klein.

The February issue of the *Revue Hispanique* is entirely given up to a *Bibliographie Hispanique Extra-péninsulaire, Seizième et Dix-Septième Siècles*, compiled by H. Vaganay. Some twelve hundred items are listed, the order being by years of publication.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Rodocanachi, *L'Attitude des Autorités Civiles et Religieuses à l'Égard de la Réformation en Piémont au XVI^e Siècle* (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, April); G. Salvemini, *La Politique Étrangère de Francesco Crispi* (Revue des Nations Latines, May 1, 16, June 1, 16); H. Bergmann, *La Crise du Socialisme Italien* (*ibid.*, July 16).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

A Gesellschaft für Kirchengeschichte of comprehensive interest and membership is being organized, which will take over as its organ the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (Gotha, Perthes). It is proposed that the fee shall not exceed twenty marks.

Die Germanen, eine Erklärung der Ueberlieferung über Bedeutung und Herkunft des Völkernamens (Munich, Beck, 1918) is presented with much detail by Birt; Professor T. Arldt has published two monographs on *Germanische Völkerwellen und ihre Bedeutung in der Bevölkerungsgeschichte von Europa* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1917, pp. xii, 226), and on *Die Völker Mitteleuropas und ihre Staatenbildungen* (*ibid.*, pp. vii, 136).

Among the most notable historical publications produced in connection with the quatercentenary of the Reformation is undoubtedly the volume of *Lutherstudien zur 4. Jahrhundertfeier der Reformation* (Weimar, Böhlau, 1918) published by the editors of the Weimar edition of Luther's works. Of the more extended monographs notice may be called to the *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1918) written by Friedensburg; *Die Erfurter Lutherstätten nach ihrer Geschichtlichen Beglaubigung* (Erfurt, Villaret, 1918) by Biereye; and *Die Konstanzer Bischöfe Hugo von Landenberg, Balthasar Merklin, Johann von Lupfen, 1496-1537, und die Glaubensspaltung* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1918) by Willburger.

A curious by-product of the war has been the attention given in Prussian reviews to the Hohenzollern claims to Silesia with the purpose of justifying the burglarious act of Frederick the Great. *Friedrich Wilhelm I. und die Preussischen Erbsprüche auf Schlesien* (Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte, XXX. 1) by G. B. Volz and *Preussisch-Oesterreichische Anleiheverhandlungen im Jahre 1703* (Zeitschrift des Vereins für Geschichte Schlesiens, LI.) by V. Loewe may be specially cited.

W. Windelband has taken the date 1771, that of the union of Baden-Baden and Baden-Durlach, as the basis for his study of *Die Verwaltung der Markgrafschaft Baden zur Zeit Karl Friedrichs* (Leipzig, Quelle

and Meyer, 1917), which is a valuable addition to the notable group of works published in recent years on the enlightened despotism and economic policy of Baden's most famous ruler.

The period of the French Revolution and of Napoleon is covered in the first volume of W. Weisweiler's *Geschichte des Rheinpreussischen Notariates* (Essen, Baedeker, 1916, pp. xxiii, 306), so that it forms an important contribution to the history of the penetration of French ideas and methods into Germany in that epoch.

Peculiar interest attaches to *Preussen und Deutschland im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1918) by Professor F. Meinecke, and to *Bayern und Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich, Franz, 1918) by Professor M. Doeberl, as careful surveys of these relationships by historical scholars of the highest competence.

G. Lacour-Gayet has produced a biography of *Bismarck* (Paris, Hachette, 1918), and a pseudonymous Ysiad is the author of *L'Allemagne et son Enfant Terrible, Maximilien Harden* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918, pp. viii, 105). W. M. Salter's analytical study of *Nietzsche the Thinker* (New York, Holt, 1917, pp. x, 539) will be of some interest to those who search for evidences of this philosopher's influence upon recent German thought and action.

The author of *J'Accuse* has completed his more elaborate exposition and denunciation of the German part in the war with the issue of the third volume of *Das Verbrechen*, or in the French edition *Le Crime* (Paris, Payot, 1918, pp. 304).

Albert Pingaud has compiled much interesting material in *La Guerre vue par les Combattants Allemands* (Paris, Perrin, 1918, pp. vi, 330).

A translation of Naumann's *Central Europe*, with an introduction by Professor W. J. Ashley, is published in London by P. S. King and Son.

Wilhelm Bauer is the chief editor of the *Oesterreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichte* (Vienna, Seidel) which began to appear in October, 1917. The review will take as its special field the whole group of Austro-Hungarian dominions, and will be somewhat popular in character.

Ein Biographisches Denkmal für das Zeitalter Kaiser Franz Josephs I. by A. Bettelheim, which originally appeared in the *Kriegs-Almanach, 1914-1916*, serves as herald of a definite programme for a *Neue Oesterreichische Biographie* to supplement Wurzbach's monumental work for the period from the Congress of Vienna to the death of Francis Joseph.

The first volume of the famous *Geschichte der Europäischen Staaten* series to appear under the editorship of Professor H. Oncken in succession to the late Professor Karl Lamprecht is the fifth volume of J. Dierauer's *Geschichte der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft* (Gotha, Perthes, 1917, pp. xxxvi, 807) which relates to the half-century from

1798 to 1848. Professor Oncken has added an inaugural preface of significant content.

La Suisse et les Traités de 1815 (Geneva, Atar, 1918) is an excellent little volume by Chapuisat.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Scholz, *Die Reformation und der Deutsche Geist* (Preussische Jahrbücher, CLXX. 1); A. von Harnack, *Die Reformation* (Internationale Monatsschrift, XI. 11); E. Troeltsch, *Luther und der Protestantismus* (Neue Rundschau, October, 1917); F. X. Keiß, *Martin Luthers Religiöse Psyche* (Hochland, XV. 1); Commandant Weil, *La Morale Politique du Grand Frédéric d'après sa Correspondance* [conclusion] (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXII. 3); H. Grappin, *Le Centenaire de Kosciuszko en Pologne Prussienne* (Revue de Paris, April 15); E. Brandenburg, *Zum Älteren Deutschen Parteiwesen; eine Erwiderung* [to F. Meinecke, Historische Zeitschrift, CXVIII.] (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIX. 1); J. Jastrow, *Why the Germans have deemed themselves Superior* [Gobineau] (Outlook, November 20); P. Louis, *Les Courants Politiques en Allemagne* (Mercure de France, September 16); A. Fortescue, *A Slav Bishop: Joseph George Strossmayer, 1815-1905* (Dublin Review, October).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The house of Martinus Nijhoff (the Hague) has begun a series of historical *Handboeken* with an important *Handboek tot de Nederlandsche Letterkundige Geschiedenis* (pp. 756), by Dr. J. Prinsen J. Lzn., and a *Handboek tot de Geschiedenis der Christelijke Kunst* (pp. xii, 284), by Professor F. Pijper of Leyden. They are to be followed by a general treatise upon the constitutional history of the Netherlands (in a broad sense, taking due account of political and other history) by Professor I. H. Gosses of Groningen and Dr. N. Japikse of the Rijksarchief at the Hague.

Dr. K. Heeringa, archivist of Zeeland, has printed in two volumes the minutes of the states of his province and of their guiding committee, from the change of system in 1578 to the end of 1579, *Notulen van de Staten van Zeeland en van hunne Gecommitteerde Raden, 1578-1579* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1916, 1917, pp. 688, 650).

Comte Louis de Lichtervelde has furnished another narrative of the thrilling parliamentary session in which Belgium resolved to fight in defense of its neutrality, under the title *Heures d'Histoire, le 4 Août 1914 au Parlement Belge* (Paris, Van Oest, 1918, pp. 64). F. Neuray has depicted the war-time conditions in Belgium in *La Belgique Nouvelle, à travers Quatre Ans de Guerre, 1914-1918* (Paris, Plon, 1918, 2 vols.). J. Mélot has collected several narratives of *Les Évasions de Belgique* (Paris, Perrin, 1918).

In *The Secret Press in Belgium* (Dutton) M. Jean Massart gives an account of those clever and mysterious publications of the last four years, of which *La Libre Belgique* is the most famous example.

Back from Belgium (New York, Fly, pp. 268), by Father Jean B. DeVille, a delegate of Cardinal Mercier, records the author's observations on deportations, atrocities, and pillage made during his journeys over Belgium during the past three years. The book also contains translations from *La Libre Belgique* and other papers clandestinely printed.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Lamy, *L'Université de Louvain* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 1).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

Under the title of *Dansk Historisk Bibliografi* (Copenhagen, Gad) Messrs. B. V. A. Erichsen and Alfred Krarup have begun the publication of a most useful manual in three volumes. Vol. III., comprising biographical books, in alphabetical order of the persons to whom they relate, appeared in 1917. The first part of vol. I. (1913) begins the more strictly historical bibliography, and carries it to 1808.

Professor Robert J. Kerner, of the University of Missouri, has prepared under the title *Slavic Europe* a selected bibliography of writings in the western European languages covering the whole field of Slavic history, languages, and literatures; it will shortly be published by the Harvard University Press.

The Jewish Publication Society has just issued the second volume of its translation of Dubnow's *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland*, covering the period from the death of Alexander I. to that of Alexander III. (1825-1894).

Russia in war-time and the antecedents of the Russian revolution are depicted by Ossip-Lourie in *La Russie en 1914-1917* (Paris, Alcan, 1918, pp. 277) and by John Pollock in *War and Revolution in Russia, Sketches and Studies* (London, Constable, 1918, pp. xviii, 280). The events of the revolution are recorded by G. Domergue in *Du Plaisir, de la Boue, du Sang; la Russie Rouge; la Dictature, la Terreur Bolcheviste, la Trahison, le Réveil* (Paris, Perrin, 1918); and in *Huit Mois de Révolution Russe, Juin 1917-Janvier 1918* (Paris, Hachette, 1918) by R. Herval.

The fourth volume of A. Gauvain's *L'Europe au Jour le Jour* (Paris, Bossard, 1918) deals with the first Balkan war. Professor J. Cvijić of the University of Belgrade has made an extensive contribution to the historical ethnography of the Balkan peninsula in *La Péninsule Balkanique, Géographie Humaine* (Paris, Colin, 1918, pp. viii, 530). The more recent history and political problems of Serbia are treated by G. Y. Devas in *La Nouvelle Serbie, Origines et Bases Sociales et Politiques, la Renaissance de l'État et son Développement Historique, Dynastie Na-*

tionale et Revendications Libératrices (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918, pp. xiv, 471).

Montenegro in History, Politics and War (London, Fisher Unwin, pp. 140), by Alexander Devine, contains in a brief and popular form some account of this country, past and present, its participation in the war, and its present situation. A bibliography of Montenegrin literature is appended.

The firm of Wilhelm Greve in Berlin has made an important contribution to the means of understanding Bulgarian history by publishing an atlas of forty maps, with text in German, English, French, and Bulgarian, of which the English title is *The Bulgarians in their Historical, Ethnographical, and Political Frontiers*. Roughly speaking, a third of the maps exhibit medieval Bulgaria at various periods, a third are reproductions of ethnological maps of dates from 1842 to 1912, originally published by persons of different nationalities, while the remainder exhibit Bulgarian boundary-history since 1870. The authors are Professors A. Ishirkoff and V. Zlatarski of Sofia. The text, and the long introduction by the Bulgarian minister at Berlin, are of course not without *Tendenz*, but since the original authors of the ethnological maps were of varying prepossessions some corrective is supplied from that fact.

From Berlin to Bagdad (Harper, pp. 370), by George A. Schreiner, tells the story of the Dardanelles, and the deportation horrors in Armenia; and gives a description of an overland journey to Damascus for the purpose of interviewing the survivors of the *Emden*.

Persecutions of the Greeks in Turkey since the beginning of the European war, translated from official Greek documents, is published for the American-Hellenic Society by the Oxford University Press (pp. 72).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. D. S., *Ansgar the Apostle of the North*, A. D. 801-865 (American Catholic Quarterly, April); A. Amato, *L'Armée et la Marine en Russie sous Pierre I. et Elisabeth* (Revue des Nations Latines, September 1); A. Långfors, *La Révolution Rouge en Finlande, Janvier-Mai 1918* (Mercure de France, August 1); I. Grinenko, *La Question de l'Ukraine, ses Origines* (Revue des Nations Latines, July 16, August 1); L. Leger, *La République de Raguse, son Rôle dans l'Histoire des Slaves Méridionaux* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, August 15); Henry Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story*, VI.-IX. [concl.] (World's Work, October-January).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

Mr. S. Couling, compiler of the *Encyclopaedia Sinica*, hopes to issue a new *Sinological Review* at Shanghai beginning in February next. It

will contain papers on the art, archaeology, history, religion, literature, language, etc., of China, and contributions have already been promised by some of the foremost writers on these subjects in Europe, America, and China. Publication, which will be either monthly or bi-monthly, will depend upon the receipt of a sufficient number of subscriptions at 30 sh. sterling. Promises to subscribe should be sent to Mr. S. Couling, Shanghai, China.

Georges Maspero of the French civil service in Indo-China is the author of an excellent volume on *La Chine* (Paris, Delagrave, 1918) in the series, *Bibliothèque d'Histoire et de Politique*.

Among the autumn publications of Macmillan and Company (London) is an historical work on *Russia, Mongolia, China, A. D. 1224-1676*, by Mr. John F. Baddeley, of which a limited edition, in two volumes, with maps and illustrations, is issued.

A volume supplementary to the edition of 1908 of the *Treaties, Conventions, etc., between China and Foreign States* has been published by order of the Chinese government (New York, Stechert).

The Far Eastern aspects of the Great War are clearly set forth by A. Gérard in *Nos Alliés d'Extrême-Orient* (Paris, Payot, 1918, pp. 251).

A new field is opened by Frederic Coleman in *Japan or Germany, the Inside Story of the Struggle in Siberia* (New York, Doran, 1918, pp. 232).

Under the title *An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century* (Longmans, pp. xvi, 187), Mr. L. F. Rushbrook-Williams presents a summary account of the career of Baber, in university lectures issued as publications of the department of modern Indian history in the University of Allahabad.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Gérard, *Les Traités de Commerce et de Navigation du Japon avec l'Occident; la Révision de 1911 et la Conclusion des Nouveaux Traités* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, August 15).

AFRICA

The history of modern Egypt is told from the two opposing sides by Hasenclever in *Geschichte Aegyptens im 19. Jahrhundert, 1798-1914* (Halle, Niemeyer, 1918) and by the late Albert Métin in *La Transformation d'Égypte* (Paris, Alcan, 1918).

Dr. Victor Demontès has published two extremely thorough and important studies of French policy in Algeria during the period of conquest. They are *Les Prévisions du Général Berthezène contre la Colonisation de l'Algérie* (Paris, Larose, 1918, pp. 318) and *La Colonisation Militaire sous Bugeaud* (*ibid.*, 1916, pp. ii, 658). For a more recent period and of even greater importance is *Le Gouvernement de l'Algérie, 1891-1897* (Paris, Champion, 1918, pp. xxiv, 448) by Jules Cambon.

The development and position of French power in North Africa is set forth in *Notre Expansion Coloniale en Afrique de 1870 à nos Jours* (Paris, Alcan, 1918) by P. Gaffarel; in *Le Prince de Bismarck et l'Expansion de la France en Afrique* (Paris, Pedone, 1918, pp. 45); in *L'Afrique du Nord et la Guerre* (Paris, Alcan, 1918) by P. Pérreau-Pradier and M. Besson; and in *Le Maroc de 1918* (Paris, Payot, 1918) by H. Dugard.

E. Payen's *Belgique et Congo* (Paris, Bossard, 1917) and Captain P. Daye's *Les Conquêtes Africaines des Belges* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1918) are brief surveys of Belgium's colonial interests and activities in Central Africa.

Mr. C. Graham Botha, who since 1912 has had charge of the archives of the Province of the Cape of Good Hope, has issued, in an interesting volume of eighty-four pages, *A Brief Guide to the Various Classes of Documents in the Cape Archives for the Period 1652-1806*, in which are described the voluminous records of the Council of Policy, of the Court of Justice, and of the Orphan Chamber, of the Dutch period, and the papers emanating, in the period 1795-1806, from the government departments during the time of the first British occupation and of the Batavian Republic. Detailed lists and a few facsimiles are given. The total mass of the archives, of which the present description covers the earlier portion, amounts to nearly 25,000 manuscript volumes.

Miss Dorothea Fairbridge's *History of South Africa* (Oxford University Press) is a brief but vivid, well-written, and well-illustrated book, much to be recommended to those seeking a small book on the subject.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Dieulafoy, *Le Maroc et les Croisades* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, January); G. Regelsperger, *L'Oeuvre Française au Togo et au Cameroun Conquis* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, August 15).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

"War-work" has by no means suspended, though it has impeded, the ordinary work of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington. Specially noteworthy progress has been made in the undertakings relative to the history of the negro and of slavery in America. Miss Donnan's volume of documents on the African slave-trade has been greatly advanced toward completion, through her own labors and through assistance received during the summer from Professor J. S. Bassett, but work in London archives will be requisite on her part before the book can be completed. Meanwhile Mrs. R. C. H. Catterall, a member of the Boston bar, is preparing from the

judicial reports of the slave states a body of material designed to exhibit slavery as an institution through the presentation of a multitude of actual cases. Other volumes of this series are in contemplation. The Institution has turned over to its historical department the preparation for publication of the mass of transcripts from the Archives of the Indies at Seville, chiefly relating to the history of the Pueblo Indians and of New Mexico, which were obtained for it by the late Dr. Adolph Bandelier and his widow, and these are being edited, with translations, by Dr. Charles W. Hackett.

After unexpected delays in printing, *Writings on American History, 1916*, the annual bibliography prepared by Miss Grace G. Griffin, is nearly ready for publication by the Yale University Press. Meantime Miss Griffin has nearly finished the manuscript of *Writings on American History, 1917*.

Ten volumes of the interesting and important series, *The Chronicles of America*, edited by Professor Allen Johnson, have thus far appeared: *Elizabethan Sea-Dogs*, by William Wood; *Crusaders of New France*, by Professor W. B. Munro; *Pioneers of the Old South*, by Miss Mary Johnston; *The Conquest of New France*, by Professor G. M. Wrong; *The Eve of the Revolution*, by Professor Carl Becker; *Washington and his Colleagues*, by Professor H. J. Ford; *The Forty-niners*, by Stewart Edward White; *The Passing of the Frontier*, by Emerson Hough; *Abraham Lincoln and the Union*, by Professor N. W. Stephenson; and *The American Spirit in Literature*, by Professor Bliss Perry. These are simply the first ten ready, of a series of fifty volumes; subscriptions will be received only for the complete series, on which the publishers, the Yale University Press, are expending, in respect to make-up and illustrations, an amount of pains evidently intended to make it the most-prized history of America for the general reader.

An announcement of importance to all historical students whose work lies in American history prior to 1801 is that of the publication of *A Catalogue of the John Carter Brown Library in Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island*, prepared by Mr. Worthington C. Ford. The intention is to complete the work in ten numbers, two per annum, of which the first is now ready. Orders may be sent to the library. The collection, practically confined to works relating to the history of America printed before 1801, makes so near an approach to completeness within its field that the catalogue is sure to be one of the most serviceable tools of the historical student.

The first three volumes of a *Historia de América desde los Tiempos más Remotas hasta nuestros Dias* (Madrid, Perlado, 1917) have been issued by J. Ortega y Rubio.

Dr. James Brown Scott has in the press *Judicial Settlement of Controversies between States of the American Union*, a compilation contain-

ing the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in all cases between our states. Primarily intended as a help toward showing that what can be done among forty-eight states of the American Union can be done among a similar number of national states in the world at large, through an international tribunal, the work can also be of much use to college teachers of American history.

A very useful pamphlet (Washington, Government Printing Office, pp. 206) is the Bureau of Education's recent *Guide to United States Government Publications*, compiled by Walter I. Swanton, and serving as a conspectus (highly serviceable in these days of frequent administrative changes) of all the governmental offices in Washington, as well as of the publications of each of them.

Source Problems in United States History, by Professor A. C. McLaughlin and others, is brought out by Harper and Brothers.

Mr. H. Nelson Gay has undertaken the editing of a series of biographical sketches of *Americani Illustri* (Florence, Bemporad) of which the first two volumes are on Lincoln, by himself, and on Jefferson, by Thomas Nelson Page. These little volumes written in clear, popular style should render a real service not only in enlightening the people of Italy concerning the eminent figures in the history of American politics, literature, and art, but also should be invaluable aids in training the Italian immigrants to the United States in the ideals of American citizenship.

Two recent numbers (214 and 215) of the *Old South Leaflets* embody extracts from the writings of Lincoln. They are: *Abraham Lincoln on War and Peace, 1860-1864*, and *Letters and Miscellaneous Writings of Abraham Lincoln, 1850-1864*, both edited by Lawrence V. Roth. Two other numbers pertain to Walt Whitman, the one (no. 216) being *Poems of Walt Whitman*, the other (no. 217) being *Selections from Walt Whitman's Specimen Days in the Civil War, 1861-1865*.

The history of Franco-American relations has recently attracted much attention. Among the evidences from the French side are *Lafayette et les États-Unis* (Paris, Figuière, 1918) by H. Margoy; *La France et la Guerre de l'Indépendance Américaine, 1776-1783* (Paris, Alcan, 1918, pp. 202) by Captain J. Merlant; and for the current period *France-Amérique* (Paris, Helleu, 1918) which is mainly a collection of national documents including President Wilson's more important state papers, collected by J. H. Woods and P. Loyson; and *Amis de la France, le Service de Campagne de l'Ambulance Américaine décrit par ses Membres* (Paris Plon, 1917).

The October number of the *Catholic Historical Review* has articles on Stephen Girard (with respect to his relations to Christianity and Catholicism), by Mgr. Hugh T. Henry; on the Catholic Church in

British Honduras, 1851-1918, by Right Rev. Dr. Frederick C. Hopkins, S. J., vicar apostolic of the province; and on the Aglipay Schism in the Philippines, by Dr. James A. Robertson. There is also a body of learned notes on the bishops of Porto Rico, from 1513 to the present time, translated from the *Sinodo Diocesano* of 1917. The installment in this number of the provisional diocesan bibliography covers the provinces of San Francisco, Boston, and Philadelphia.

A Century of Negro Migration, by C. G. Woodson, deals with the exodus of negroes from the South (Washington, *Journal of Negro History*).

The volume by D. H. Van Doren, *Workmen's Compensation and Insurance* (Moffat, Yard, and Company), one of the prize essays of the department of political science of Williams College, contains a chapter devoted to the history of workmen's compensation.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

Our European Ancestors: an Introduction to United States History, by Eva March Tappan, comes from the press of Houghton Mifflin Company.

Mr. Charles K. Bolton, librarian of the Boston Athenaeum, is both author and publisher of a novel work in two handsome volumes, entitled *The Founders*, and containing 150 photogravure reproductions of original portraits of persons who came to the North American colonies before 1701, with an introduction on the portraiture of the period, biographical sketches of the subjects, and comments on the portraits, many of which have never been reproduced before.

The Macmillan Company has brought out a volume by Professor Roland G. Usher entitled *The Pilgrims and their History*.

An additional volume of the *Yale Historical Publications*, announced by the Yale University Press, is a treatise on *The Quit-Rent System in the American Colonies*, by Professor Beverley W. Bond, jr., of Purdue University.

Professor Charles F. Himes, of the Dickinson School of Law, upon the basis of long-continued and interesting researches, in Carlisle and elsewhere, has published, in a pamphlet of 70 pages, *Life and Times of Judge Thomas Cooper, Jurist, Scientist, Educator, Author, and Publicist* (the author, Carlisle, 1918) in which the reader will find both learning and entertainment.

J. M. Stahl is the author of two studies of the War of 1812: *The Battle of Plattsburg* and *The Invasion of the City of Washington*. The latter volume is especially designed to point out the disastrous consequences of unpreparedness (Argos, Indiana, Van Trump).

Volume III., number 4, of the *Smith College Studies in History* is a pamphlet of some sixty pages, on Northern Opinion of Approaching Secession, in which a valuable mass of material is brought to bear upon the history of political opinion in the period from John Brown's insurrection to the secession of South Carolina.

The Arguments and Speeches of William Maxwell Evarts, in three volumes, edited, with an introduction, by his son, Sherman Evarts, of the New York bar, has been published by the Macmillan Company. The work includes the arguments in the Lemmon Slave Case, in the impeachment trial of President Johnson, in the case of the Alabama Claims, and many speeches of a political or patriotic character.

Messrs. Lippincott have included in their *Trail Blazers* series *General Crook and the Fighting Apaches* [etc.], by E. L. Sabin.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR

From Isolation to Leadership: a Review of American Foreign Policy, by Professor J. H. Latané, is from the press of Doubleday, Page, and Company.

America in France, by Maj. Frederick Palmer, the noted war correspondent (Dodd, Mead, and Company), gives an account of what each American division in France has been doing in the war.

No. 18 in the *War Information Series* published by the Committee on Public Information is a *Regimental History of the United States Regular Army, Chronological Outline, 1866-1918* (pp. 48) prepared by the Adjutant General's Office. As no. 19 the committee has issued *Lieber and Schurz: Two Loyal Americans of German Birth*, by Professor Evarts B. Greene, and, as no. 21, *America's War Aims and Peace Program*, by Professor Carl Becker, a full and careful statement of the successive moves toward peace, with appendixes containing useful material on a League of Nations and like topics. It is announced that the remaining stock of the committee's valuable publications has been taken over by the World Peace Foundation, 40 Mt. Vernon Street, Boston, to which requests for copies should be addressed.

A College Man in Khaki (Doran, pp. 234) contains the letters of Wainwright Merrill giving an account of his training experiences in England and of fighting in Flanders until his death at Ypres, May, 1917.

More than ordinary literary excellence marks the letters of Jack Wright, first lieutenant of American aviation in France, April, 1917-January, 1918, published under the title, *A Poet of the Air* (Houghton Mifflin, pp. 246).

With the Help of God and a Few Marines, by Brig.-Gen. A. W. Catlin, which will be published in January by Doubleday, Page, and Company, is the story of the American marines up to and including the

engagements of Belleau Wood and Château Thierry. The author was the colonel of the Fifth Regiment of Marines until promotion after Belleau Wood.

The work of our navy in its various activities is described by Lawrence Perry in *Our Navy in the War* (Scribner's, pp. 279).

French Strother, managing editor of *The World's Work*, has brought together in book form his series of articles in that magazine entitled *Fighting Germany's Spies: a Revelation of German Intrigues in America*. (See also pp. 317-321)

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

Through the generosity of Hon. James Phinney Baxter, president of the Maine Historical Society, a transcript, in four large volumes, has been made of the miscellaneous records of the courts of the province of Maine, now in the office of the county clerk of York county, and has been deposited in the society's library. Mr. Baxter has also deposited with the society twenty-one volumes of transcripts relating to the early history of Maine, copied from originals in various repositories. Among these is a volume of rare maps and plans.

A small volume of brief biographies of the early settlers of the Magalloway region in Maine and New Hampshire, entitled *Pioneers of the Magalloway from 1820 to 1904*, by G. P. Wilson, is brought out in Old Orchard, Maine, by the author.

The *Proceedings* of the Vermont Historical Society for the years 1916-1917 (the title page has "1915-1916"), just published, contains a paper by Hon. Lyman S. Hayes on the Navigation of the Connecticut River, an historical address delivered before the society in January, 1917.

A paper by Dr. Ralph V. Harlow on Economic Conditions in Massachusetts during the American Revolution is reprinted, in advance, from volume XX. of the *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*.

In the October number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* Sidney Perley writes concerning the Plains: Part of Salem in 1700; Francis B. C. Bradlee continues his history of the Boston and Lowell, Nashua and Lowell, and Salem and Lowell railroads.

The vital records, to 1850, of the Massachusetts towns of Carlisle, Shirley, and West Newbury have been published by the usual state and local agencies.

A History of New Bedford, in three volumes, edited by Z. W. Pease, is put forth by the Lewis Publishing Company.

The Centennial History of the Harvard Law School, 1817-1917, written and compiled by the faculty with assistance of graduates, is published by the Harvard Law School Association.

A Brief History of the Massachusetts Agricultural College (1867-1917), by L. B. Caswell, is no. 1 of the *Semicentennial Publications* (Springfield, Bassette). No. 2 is a *Bibliography* of the college, prepared by the librarian, Mr. Charles R. Green. The bibliography is in two parts, "The Institution" and "The Men". Part 2 is in preparation (Amherst, the college).

The April issue of the *Rhode Island Historical Society Collections* contains a first section (to 1758) of a chronological check-list of maps of Rhode Island in the society's library.

The Connecticut Historical Society has received, as a gift from its president, Charles E. Gross, a selection of the correspondence (aggregating about 3000 letters of the period 1834-1860) of Colonel Samuel Colt of Hartford, inventor and manufacturer of firearms. The society has also received considerable bodies of materials of value for genealogy and local history, including about 75 volumes of transcripts compiled by the late Julius Gray of Farmington, presented to the society by his widow.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The division of archives and history in the University of the State of New York presents, in a pamphlet of forty-eight pages, a detailed and excellent *Historical Account and Inventory of Records of the City of Kingston*.

The Lutherans of New York: their Story and their Problems, by Rev. G. U. Wenner, has been published in New York by the Petersfield Press.

A History and Description of the Manufacture and Mining of Salt in New York State, by C. J. Werner (pp. 144), is published at Huntington, N. Y., by the author.

The New York Public Library has received from the Governors of the Society of the New York Hospital the original journal of William M. Clarke, surgeon's mate on board the *President* and the *Argus* in 1812 and 1813. The library's *Bulletin* continues in the June-October numbers the census of fifteenth-century books owned in America, and also the lists of recent accessions pertaining to the European war.

The Story of the "Sun", 1833-1918, by Frank M. O'Brien (Doran), is a useful contribution to the not-too-edifying history of New York journalism.

In the January issue of the *Proceedings* of the New Jersey Historical Society is a paper by Katharine M. Beekman, "A Colonial Capital",

describing life in old Perth Amboy. In the same issue is a letter of Governor William Franklin, written September 15, 1777, from Litchfield jail, in Connecticut, where he was confined by the orders of the Continental Congress.

The *Acts and Proceedings* of the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies for its thirteenth annual meeting (January, 1918, pp. 87) contains the usual detailed account of activities on the part of a multitude of societies in the state.

In the last January number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* are the beginnings of two series of interest. The one is a History of the Philadelphia and Lancaster Turnpike, said to be the first long turnpike in the United States. The article is by Hon. Charles I. Landis and is accompanied by a map. The other is a series of letters of Edward Burd, prothonotary of the supreme court of Pennsylvania, 1778-1805. These letters (the earliest was written in 1765) are from the originals in the Pennsylvania State Library and are not found in the *Burd Papers* (ed. Lewis Burd Walker). They are edited by Thomas L. Montgomery. Both these series are continued in the April number of the *Magazine*. In the January number are also found some colonial and Revolutionary letters. In the April number is a paper, by Henry Budd, on Thomas Sully, the painter.

The contents of the September number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* include, besides continued articles hitherto mentioned, an Historical Sketch of the Diocese of Harrisburg, by Right Rev. Monsignor M. M. Hassett.

In the September number of the *Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society* an article by Rev. E. Y. Hill, entitled Some Leaders of the General Synod, sketches the careers of some of the principal Presbyterian divines of the eighteenth century in Philadelphia and New Jersey.

The principal content of the October number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* is a paper, by Charles W. Dahlinger, on Old Allegheny.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The Maryland Historical Society has received from Mrs. Mary H. Sumwalt, a member of the society, a copy (pp. 226) of the records of marriages solemnized by ministers of the Methodist Episcopal churches of Baltimore, 1807-1866.

The article of chief interest in the June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* is a study of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney: his Career at the Frederick Bar, by Edward S. Delaplaine. The *Magazine* prints a number of Taney letters, principally letters to him from prominent men, ranging over the years from 1825 to 1871. It is not apparent why the letters should not have been inserted in chronological order. There is

also a study of Daniel Dulany the Younger (1722-1797), by Richard H. Spencer.

Volume X. of the *Bulletin* of the Virginia State Library, the volume for 1917, consists entirely of part II. of Mr. Earl G. Swem's *Bibliography of Virginia* (pp. x, 1404), embracing the titles of the official publications of the commonwealth from 1776 through 1916, arranged in chronological order and recorded with exemplary care. It is announced that part III. will contain a selection of the most important United States documents which relate to Virginia.

There have recently been brought to light in the Virginia State Library twenty-five bound volumes of original manuscript muster- and pay-rolls of the War of 1812 estimated to contain about two hundred thousand names. The library has received through Mrs. Olaf Axell Ljungstedt a detailed card-index of the earlier records of Isle of Wight County. Among the papers recently transferred to the library from the auditor's office was found a considerable body of the correspondence of Colonel William Preston. Several volumes of Preston papers are in the Draper Collection in the library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and a calendar of them was issued by the society in 1915 (*The Preston and Virginia Papers*; see this *Review*, XXI. 416). Of those in the Virginia State Library a selection is being printed in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, the first installment (1774-1780) appearing in the October number.

The principal article in the October number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* is a paper concerning Fredericksburg in Revolutionary Days, to which are appended numerous documents, many of them drawn from the executive papers, etc., in the Virginia State Library.

The *North Carolina Booklet* for July contains the second part, running from 1780 to 1783, of Professor Archibald Henderson's biographical account of Isaac Shelby.

The *Official and Statistical Register* of the state of Mississippi, centennial edition, 1917, in addition to a variety of historical matter usually contained in such publications, presents, from a state census taken in 1816, the names of all the heads of families in the counties then existing.

The principal content of the *Publications* of the Mississippi Historical Society, Centenary Series, vol. II. (pp. 604), is a study of War and Reconstruction in Mississippi, 1863-1890, by J. S. McNeily; rather the present monograph is a completion of the author's history of reconstruction, of which studies of separate phases have appeared in earlier volumes of the society. Lesser papers in this volume are: a somewhat detailed history of the Noxubee Squadron of the First Mississippi Cavalry, 1861-1865, by J. G. Deupree; Did DeSoto discover the Mississippi

River in Tunica County, Mississippi? by Dr. Dunbar Rowland; and the Eleventh Mississippi Regiment at Gettysburg, by Baxter McFarland.

WESTERN STATES

In the *Proceedings* of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association for 1916-1917, published as an extra number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, there are three papers of importance. Professor J. A. James, in an excellent piece of historical criticism, discusses the Value of the Memoir of George Rogers Clark as an Historical Document; Professor W. W. Sweet presents an excellent general survey of the processes and results involved in the Coming of the Circuit Rider across the Mountains; and Mr. Wayne E. Stevens writes of the general history of the Fur-Trade Companies in the Northwest, 1760-1816.

In the September number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* Dr. L. B. Shippee of the University of Minnesota has a paper on the First Railroad between the Mississippi and Lake Superior; Mr. Logan Esarey of the University of Indiana, one on the Literary Spirit among the Early Ohio Valley Settlers; Professor James E. Winston of Mississippi, on the "Lost Commission", meaning the commission by the governor of that state, in 1844, appointing Jacob Thompson as senator in succession to Robert J. Walker but withheld by the latter; and a general survey of Historical Activities in Canada, 1917-1918, by Mr. James F. Kenney of the Canadian Archives. Professor Archibald Henderson has a note on the Mecklenburg Declaration, setting forth new evidence of considerable importance.

A conference of the directors of historical activities in the north-western states has been called to meet in Chicago, December 7, to consider problems connected with the continuance of co-operative work in Washington, and also to consider the feasibility of co-operating with the Historical Branch of the General Staff of the United States Army in the collection and preservation of material relating to the Great War.

The Historical Commission of Ohio, appointed by the governor in February, 1918, as the official agency of the state for the collection and preservation of records and materials pertaining to Ohio's part in the present war, has effected a co-operative arrangement with the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society whereby the facilities of the society's building are placed at the disposal of the commission and the collections of the commission are to be deposited in the society's library. The commission, of which Professor Arthur M. Schlesinger of the Ohio State University is chairman, has made commendable progress both in the organization of county branches of the commission and in the collection of materials of many sorts, pictorial, printed, written, emblematical, relics, etc. The Illinois Council of Defense has lately established a similar commission.

The *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* prints in the July-September number the eighth of the Selections from the Torrence Papers. Those in this issue are miscellaneous military papers of the years 1787-1812.

The issue of the *Indiana Magazine of History* for September consists entirely of a single monograph of 104 pages, by Mr. Mayo Fesler, on Secret Political Societies in the North during the Civil War, a thoroughgoing study of the Knights of the Golden Circle, Sons of Liberty, and Northwest Confederacy, of the treason trials in Indiana resulting from their activity, and of the Camp Douglas conspiracy. Mr. Fesler has not only gathered together his materials with much industry but has constructed a very interesting narrative and expressed sane judgments regarding the whole movement.

The State Historical Library of Illinois has lately sent to press a volume devoted to the papers of Governor Edward Coles.

The present status of the *Centennial History of Illinois*, planned to commemorate the admission of Illinois as a state in 1818, may be described as follows: vol. II., *The Frontier States, 1818-1848*, by Lieutenant Pease, and vol. III., *The Era of Transition, 1848-1870*, by Professor Cole, are printed and bound; vol. IV., *The Industrial State, 1870-1893*, by Professors Bogart and Thompson, is in galley-proof; vol. V., *The Modern Commonwealth, 1893-1918*, by Professors Bogart and Mathews, is in page-proof but is waiting for the completion of the general index; vol. I., *District and Territory, 1673-1818*, by Professor Alvord, has been seriously delayed by illness on his part, but is practically ready for the press.

The Chicago Historical Society has received during the past year a portion of the collection of autograph letters relating to the period of the Revolution formed by the late Henry C. Van Schaack, chiefly from papers of members of the Van Schaack family; also five account-books, 1831-1847, of the sutlers of Fort Dearborn.

The first two numbers of the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review* make an exceedingly creditable beginning of its career. The three principal papers, each of them appearing in installments in both numbers, are careful and well-supported articles on Early Catholicity in Chicago, by Rev. Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., on the Early Missions, by the editor, Mr. Joseph J. Thompson, and on Father Pierre Gibault by the same writer. Professor C. W. Alvord has a brief paper on the Sources of Catholic History in Illinois. Miss Catherine Schaefer contributes to both numbers the beginnings of a chronology of missions and churches in the state. In the October number there is a narrative of Catholic transactions in Kaskaskia, written in 1838 by Father Benedict Roux, pastor of that parish. The *Annals* of the Leopoldine Association are drawn upon for other documents. The new journal evidently intends to maintain a high standard, and is deserving of cordial support.

In the September number of the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* A. C. Quisenberry writes concerning the Battles of Big Hill and Richmond, Kentucky, September, 1862.

The June number of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* includes an account, by R. S. Cotterill, of the Memphis Railroad Convention of 1849, Some Suggestions as to the Equipment needed in the Teaching of History, by Professor St. George L. Sioussat, and a continuation of A. V. Goodpasture's narratives of Indian Wars and Warriors of the Old Southwest.

The July number of the *Michigan History Magazine* contains a report on the archives in the department of state at the state capitol, Lansing; a paper on Indian Place Names in the Upper Peninsula and their Interpretation, by Rev. William F. Gagnieur, S. J.; and one on County Organization in Michigan, by William H. Hathaway. The October number contains a short paper by John A. Lemmer on Father Allouez; two of the prize essays in the Michigan Historical Commission's contest on the subject Why the United States is at War, by Mahlon H. Buell and Miss Etta Kinch; and an article by Professor R. M. Wenley concerning the part which the University of Michigan has taken in the war (the "First Phase").

Nos. 7 and 8 of Mr. Burton's *Manuscripts from the Burton Historical Collection* (pp. 273-401) continue Harrison's despatches of 1811 and 1812 to Secretary Eustis; but the chief element in the former is a series of letters, 1786-1809, from Rev. John Heckewelder and Rev. Gottlieb Senseman to John Askin, with other Askin correspondence, relating to the various settlements of the Moravians from Gnadenhütten in places under British authority near Detroit. In the latter number there is a series of Sandusky letters of 1782 and 1783 relating to local trade.

The *Wisconsin Magazine of History* prints in the September issue a journal of St. Clair's campaign in 1791, kept by Capt. Samuel Newman of Boston, commanding the Second U. S. Regiment. The journal begins July 30, when the regiment left Philadelphia for Pittsburgh, and ends October 23, twelve days before the disaster which overtook St. Clair's expedition, in which the diarist was slain. In the same number of the *Magazine* Miss Louise P. Kellogg discusses the Bennett law in Wisconsin, a law which aimed to require the teaching of English in the schools and compulsory attendance. The discussion is prefaced by an examination into the history and character of the German settlers in Wisconsin.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has published (*Bulletin* no. 93, pp. 91) a *Supplementary Catalogue of Newspaper Files* in its library, listing the papers acquired during the years 1911-1917.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIV.—23.

A group of essays on the causes and issues of the war, by members of the faculty of the University of Wisconsin, has been published under the title *War Book of the University of Wisconsin* (Madison, 1918, pp. 266).

The Public Safety Commission of Minnesota has established a War Records Commission consisting of a director and twelve members appointed by the governor. Franklin F. Holbrook is director, and Solon J. Buck is chairman.

The Minnesota Historical Society has acquired, partly as a gift, partly as a loan, a collection of the papers of the late Gen. William Le Duc, who served in the quartermaster's department in the Civil War and was commissioner of agriculture under President Hayes, 1877-1881.

In the August number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* Mr. Chessley J. Posey discusses the Influence of Geographic Factors in the Development of Minnesota.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has brought out *The Spirit Lake Massacre*, by Thomas Teakle. The massacre of the white settlers in the region of Lake Okoboji and Spirit Lake in March, 1857, is one of the most notable episodes in the early history of Iowa, and the story has been frequently told. Mr. Teakle has gone carefully through all the sources of information concerning the massacre and has not only produced an interesting and authoritative narrative of the affair, but, examining into its underlying causes, has not spared the white race from criticism.

The latest issues of *Iowa and War* relate to the World War. They are: First, Second, and Third Liberty Loans in Iowa, by Nathaniel R. Whitney, and Social Work at Camp Dodge, drawn largely from a study by Dr. F. E. Haynes.

The Missouri Historical Society has recently received from the son and daughters of the late James O. Broadhead the original manuscripts of his political, historical, and professional writings, many of which are unpublished. The gift included also a large quantity of private letters, covering a period of about fifty years; the letters being written by Edward Bates, Frank P. Blair, Montgomery Blair, Samuel T. Glover, John B. Henderson, James S. Rollins, John W. Henry, with occasional letters from nearly every prominent man of the day. The more important of the letters relate to events in Missouri in 1860-1865.

The April number of the *Missouri Historical Review* contains an account of the proceedings of Missouri's First Centennial Day (January 8, 1918) and the second of H. A. Trexler's articles on Missouri-Montana Highways. In the July number appears an account, by R. S. Cotterill, of the National Railroad Convention in St. Louis, 1849. In the same number Professor E. M. Violette comes forward again with his sketches

of Missourians Abroad, the subject of this sketch being Provost Marshal General E. H. Crowder. In the October number the subject is Edward R. Stettinius. Floyd C. Shoemaker's articles concerning Missouri and the War are continued through the three numbers, as is also Gottfried Duden's Report. In the October number is also found an article, by David W. Eaton, on How Missouri Counties, Towns, and Streams were named.

A North Dakota War History Commission has been appointed by the governor to collect materials relating to the Great War and ultimately to publish a history of North Dakota's participation in the war. The commission is composed of Professor O. G. Libby of the University of North Dakota, chairman, Mrs. Charles F. Amidon of Fargo, and Dr. Melvin R. Gilmore of Bismarck.

In the June number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* appear two chapters of a study of the Federal Relations of Oregon, by Dr. L. B. Shippee. The first of these sets forth the situation of Oregon in 1819; the second discusses Congress and Oregon, 1819-1829.

A *History of Imperial County, California*, edited by F. C. Farr, has been brought out in Berkeley (Elms Publishing Company).

CANADA

The Public Archives of Canada have recently acquired a long-lost volume containing the original observations drawn up by the judges of Quebec after the investigation of 1787, respecting the administration of justice in the province.

Bulletin no. 28 of the departments of history and political science in Queen's University is a pamphlet on Sir George Arthur and his Administration of Upper Canada, by Walter Sage. No. 29 completes Mr. O. D. Skelton's paper, begun in no. 16, on Canadian Federal Finance.

To his standard volume listing political appointments in Canada from 1867 to 1895, published in 1896, N. O. Côté has added a second volume, *Political Appointments, Parliaments, and the Judicial Bench of the Dominion of Canada, 1896 to 1917*.

Messrs. Morang and Company are preparing a co-operative history in six volumes, *Canada in the Great World War*. The first volume, which has already appeared, is devoted entirely to military history, from its beginning to the outbreak of the war.

An *Almanach du Centenaire, 1816-1916, Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon* (Paris, Renaudie, 1918, pp. 359) has been compiled by D. Gauvain. This little colony was finally restored to France in 1816.

Hon. J. S. McLennan, a Canadian senator, has prepared a comprehensive quarto on *Louisbourg from its Foundation to its Fall* (Macmillan).

The Abbé Gosselin has published the second part of *L'Église du Canada après la Conquête* (Imprimerie Laflamme) covering the years from 1775 to 1789.

M. Pierre-Georges Roy has begun the publication of a catalogue of the provincial archives of Quebec. The first two volumes have been published, containing the *Inventaire d'une Collection de Pièces Judiciaires, Notariales, etc., conservées aux Archives Judiciaires de Québec*.

The Centenary of the Bank of Montreal, 1817-1917 (Montreal, the Bank, pp. 107), is a carefully prepared and illustrated account, in annalistic form, of the oldest bank in British North America.

The thirteenth *Report* of the Ontario Bureau of Archives contains a translation of that portion of the travels of the Duke of La Rochefoucault-Liancourt relating to Upper Canada in 1795-1797, and an extended contemporary critique of those chapters by David W. Smith, speaker of the legislative assembly of Upper Canada. The volume is edited by Hon. W. R. Riddell of the High Court of Justice.

The late J. Ross Robertson of Toronto left to the Public Reference Library in that city a collection of over 3700 pictures relating to the history of Canada. The library has published a list entitled *Guide to the J. Ross Robertson Historical Collection*.

The *Papers and Records*, vol. XV., of the Ontario Historical Society contains the address, Canadian History as a Subject of Research, delivered in June, 1916, by President Clarence M. Warner.

The *Papers and Records* of the Lennox and Addington Historical Society, vol. IX., contains a calendar, with extensive extracts, of the Canniff collection of documents relating to the Bay of Quinte district in the period 1770-1834.

Part IX. of the *Transactions* of the London and Middlesex Historical Society has an article, by Fred Landon, on the history of the Wilberforce colony of colored refugees from the United States, established in Middlesex in 1829-1830.

No. 29 of the *Publications* of the Niagara Historical Society contains a body of correspondence regarding affairs on the Niagara frontier during the rebellion of 1837-1838.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The August number of the *Hispanic American Historical Review* opens with two important articles, by Professors William S. Robertson and William R. Shepherd, the former on the Recognition of the Hispanic American Nations by the United States, the latter on Bolívar and the United States. The editor presents text and translation of three letters from the Archives of the Indies, dated in 1776, 1777, and 1778,

throwing light on the relations between Spain and the American Revolution; one of them is from Governor Unzaga to José de Galvez, the other two are from Governor Bernardo de Galvez to the same. The bibliographical section continues Dr. Chapman's description of certain *legajos* in the Archives of the Indies.

The Cortes Society has been formed in New York for the purpose of publishing documents and narratives concerning the discovery and conquest and settlement of Latin America, with suitable introductions and notes. It will be the policy of the society to publish English translations of original sources, material which has never before appeared in English being chosen. The officers of the society are: president, F. W. Hodge; vice-president, Gen. Hugh L. Scott; secretary-treasurer, Marshall H. Saville (Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, New York City). The council consists of these officers and also of Messrs. George P. Winship and Philip A. Means. The two volumes already published are: the *Narrative of the Conquest of Mexico* by the Anonymous Conqueror (translated by Mr. Saville) and the *Relation of the Conquest of Peru* by Pedro Sancho (translated by Mr. Means). During the next twelvemonth three or more equally important translations will appear. Membership entails the payment of no regular dues, the only obligation resting upon members being that of buying the volumes, which are issued at cost. Communications should be addressed to the secretary-treasurer, whose address appears above.

A Syllabus of Latin-American History, prepared by Professor W. W. Pierson, jr., of the University of North Carolina, though designed primarily for the use of students in that institution, may be of much value elsewhere; it is intended toward a comprehensive study of the whole history of Latin-American civilization.

The Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, at Harvard University, has published, as vol. VII. of its *Papers* (pp. xv, 206), *The History of the Spanish Conquest of Yucatan and the Itzas*, by Mr. Philip A. Means.

Inter-America reprints in the November issue, with the title *La Real Hacienda en los Primeros Tiempos del Coloniaje Español*, Professor Clarence H. Haring's article, the Early Spanish Colonial Exchequer, in the July number of the *Review*.

In the March-June number of the *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* is found a further account, with facsimiles, of Cuban periodicals of the first half of the nineteenth century (see this journal, XXII. 761, 955). Among the documents are two papers, variants of each other, giving an extended account of conditions, principally economic and agricultural, in Cuba in 1800. Both papers, it appears, are from the pen of Don Antonio del Valle Hernández. Two other groups of documents of interest are these: "Expediente sobre la publicación de un artículo inserto en la

Heraldo de New York, en que se difama la conducta del Gobierno y autoridades" (1842-1843); and "Sucesos ocurridos con motivo de la explosion ocurrida en el barco Americano *Maine* surto en bahia". The latter documents are dated February 16 to 19, 1898.

Señor Francisco José Urrutia has published at Bogotá (Imprenta Nacional) an historical work on *Los Estados Unidos de América y las Repúblicas Hispanoamericanas de 1810 a 1830*.

G. Arboleda, vice-president of the National Academy of History, has published the first volume of a *Historia Contemporánea de Colombia desde la Disolución de la Antigua República de ese Nombre hasta la Época Presente* (Bogotá, Camacho, Roldan, and Tamayo, 1918, pp. 490). The volume treats of the period from 1829 to 1841 and claims to be impartial, critical, and national, but it is apparently based only on secondary material.

The Hakluyt Society expects before long to print an English translation of the *Memorias Antiguas é Historiales* of Fernando Montesinos (relating to Peru), prepared by Mr. Philip A. Means.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: D. Hannay, *Spanish Trade with the Indies* (Edinburgh Review, October); A. M. de Poncheville, *L'Amitié d'Amérique et de France* (Mercure de France, July 16); F. P. Renaut, *Le Gouvernement Portugais à Rio-de-Janeiro, 1808-1821*, I. (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXII. 3); E. S. Delaplaine, *Chief Justice Roger B. Taney: His Career as a Lawyer* (American Law Review, July-August); L. N. Feipel, *The Navy and Filibustering in the Fifties* [concluded] (U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, September); C. A. Post, *A Diary of the Blockade in 1863* (*ibid.*, October); R. de Cardenas, *La Política de los Estados Unidos en el Continente Americano*, III.-VII. (Cuba Contemporánea, May-October); T. H. S. Escott, *The American Embassy* [London] (Contemporary Review, October); George MacAdam, *The Life of General Pershing* (World's Work, November); G. Deschamps, *Sous le Drapeau Étoilé* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 1); A. T. Vollweiler, *Roosevelt's Ranch Life in North Dakota* (Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota, October); G. L. Burr, *Andrew Dickson White* (The Nation, November 16); C. N. Hitchcock, *The War Industries Board: its Development, Organization, and Functions* (Journal of Political Economy, June).